THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

VOL. XXXVII, No. 1 JANUARY, 1930

Swedenborg as a Geologist
LEWIS FIELD HITE 1

Early Influence of Swedenborg in Europe
CLARENCE HOTSON, PH.D. 16

The Unwritten Commandments
JOHN P. SUTHERLAND, M. D., SC.D 35

Religion Versus Humanism
LEWIS FIELD HITE 51

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

37
930

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

The Love of the Neighbor LEWIS F. HITE - - - - - 80

The New Church and the Social Doctrine WILLIAM F. WUNSCH 88

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

How the New Church Regards the Virgin Mary
JOHN GODDARD - - - - - - - - - - - 95

The Theological Works and Textual Criticism of the Bible (I) WILLIAM F. WUNSCH - - - - - - - 101

Current Literature :

Frank W. Very's "An Epitome of Swedenborg's Science" B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - 111

Charles Albert Hall's "The Blessed Way"
JOHN DABOLL - - - - - - - - - - - 117

Frank Knight Sanders' "History of the Hebrews"
LOUIS A. DOLE - - - - - - - - - - - 118

A. E. Waite's "The Holy Kabbalah"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - - 122

William S. Sadler's "The Mind at Mischief"
JOHN WHITEHEAD - - - - - - - - - - 126

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 8 Cents, and to Europe 16 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.—*President*, Rev. Paul Sperry, 1824 Park Road, Washington, D. C.; *Vice-President*, Mr. Ezra Hyde Alden, 1223 Commercial Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; *Secretary*, Mr. B. A. Whittemore, 134 Bowdoin Street, Boston 9, Mass.; *Treasurer*, Mr. Albert P. Carter, 511 Barristers Hall, Boston, Mass.

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXVII.] JANUARY, 1930 [No. 1

SWEDENBORG AS A GEOLOGIST

BY THE REV. LEWIS FIELD HITE, A.M.

GEOGRAPHY and geology form the natural approach to the study and science of nature. Swedenborg's position in the history of geology has yet to be determined. It would involve a careful comparison of his observations and contributions with those of his predecessors, who were few in the scientific sense, especially in Sweden. Scientific geology is said to have begun with Werner, who did his work in the generation following Swedenborg, and mostly in Germany. Swedenborg's geological observations were wide, and carried to minute details; they were accompanied by penetrating intellectual analysis and interpretation, and directed by free and bold theorizing.

Alfred G. Nathorst, Professor of Geology in the University of Upsala, has this to say of Swedenborg as a geologist:

> That the contributions of Swedenborg and Linnæus in the geological field have been less valued than they deserve, is without doubt due to this, that their fame in other fields was so great that what they have produced in geology in comparison therewith seems relatively unimportant, and has therefore been much overlooked.

He goes on to give in more than 20 pages an interesting and valuable account of Swedenborg's work in geology, and concludes with this parting estimate:

From the account given in the preceding pages, the statement made in the beginning of this Introduction is justified, namely, that Swedenborg's contributions in the field of geology are of such significance and sweep, that they alone would have been sufficient to have secured for him a respected scientific name. . . . One immediately notices in studying Swedenborg's geological writings, that an investigating nature of the highest rank is in question, which on a solid foundation and with sharp powers of observation noticed everything, even what was apparently insignificant, in order to draw conclusions from it, and which when possible endeavored to control the correctness of the same by experiment. The wealth of observations which he collected from various parts of Europe is astonishing, and he did this at a comparatively early age.

He closes with this well deserved tribute:

The condition of Chemistry at this time was a great disadvantage to him, for he could not make use of it to arrive at a final solution of various questions even when he was on the right road. But the manysidedness, to which his geological works bear witness, is truly remarkable; nearly all questions of great significance for the geology of that time are touched upon by him, and still these works are but a minor portion of his whole scientific activity, which in many respects was far ahead of his times. For he was also a mathematician, astronomer, cosmologist, physicist, mechanic, chemist, anatomist, and physiologist. What Anders Retzius said about Swedenborg's "Regnum Animale," that it was a "wonder book," in which are found "ideas which belong to the most recent times, a compass, induction, and tendency, which can only be compared to that of Aristotle," seems after the experience now attained to be capable of application to practically the whole of his scientific activity. His was a mighty spirit, of which our country has the more reason to be proud, because it was united with a personality in every respect noble and unassuming.

This is the estimate of one who is competent both in the history and the science of his subject; and this estimate can be multiplied at pleasure from the testimony of specialists and of well informed men generally.

Of this early period, we have translations of four of his geological publications. They are:

1. On Mussels, Snails, etc., in Limestone; and on Slate.
2. On Certain Kinds of Soil and Mud.
3. On the Height of Water and the Strong Tides in the Primæval World.
4. On the Indications of the Deluge; Letter to Melle.

The first two were written some time in 1716, and we may properly begin with them. The paper on Mussels and Snails is a single sheet, and seems to have been the first record of his geological observations. It is worth quoting in part as an illustration of his method of observation:

At Udvalla, just outside of the town, there is found a kind of limestone which consists entirely of Mussels. It is taken out of the ground a little below the soil in which [farmers] are wont to sow their seeds. This mussel-stone extends downwards about one or two ells [a Swedish ell aln, is about two feet]; and under it there is hard rock. When the limestone, as in other cases, is burned into lime [kalck], by means of dry and green wood mixed together, a fine lime is produced, which down here at this place is called "lim."

2. In the parish of Tunhem, it is reported that there is found a mussel-stone of the same kind, of which they are also beginning to make lime, as at Udvalla; the place near which it is found is called Addetorp.

3. In the parish of Sharke, near the rectory of Hojentorp, and thereabouts in the hills and heights, there is found a kind of anthraconite or slate, which perhaps may also be used for making lime. In it are found a great many small insects, in some of it in such abundance, that the stone has been altogether coagulated by them.

4. Occasionally, also, some mussels of the smallest kind are found among the insects.

5. At Billingen, near Oglanda church, there is a mountain spot where some petrified snails are also found. These perhaps went into the clay, were compressed by its being flooded over, and afterwards petrified together with it. Such snails are found in abundance round about Billingen, especially during spring.

He goes on to describe the slate which is found on Billingen and elsewhere, and to speak of its uses.

The paper, a single sheet, "On Certain Kinds of Soil and

Mud," is so characteristic of his minute observation and his manysided interests, that it is worth special attention. We read:

In Westergyln are found certain kinds of soil and mud which may be employed for many uses and purposes. In the parish of Rhyda, a short distance from the rectory, in a beautiful grove, there are three springs which flow forth in a row; out of the first there flows ordinary spring water, out of the second or middle one a medium mineral water, and out of the third a mineral water which is still stronger but with a milder taste. The stones which these two kinds of water run over are of a reddish or vivid orange color, as at other mineral springs; the mud or ochre just below is also of the same color, and might be removed in large quantities. Down below there is a marsh in which all the kinds of water are gathered, where the same mud becomes coal black, and settles itself in layers which are one-half, one, one and a half, or two feet thick. Underneath there is a sandy bottom of white fine sand, quite serviceable for hour glasses, and still further below there is a stony bottom. I have also examined the stones, upon which there is some glitter of a silver color, as if there had been a silver deposit, for it differs in color from ordinary glitter. There are also found in the same marsh or dam fish which hide themselves in the mud, so that they cannot be easily caught by nets or similar contrivances; their color is blackish, and in this they differ from ordinary fish. The uppermost mud is used for dyeing the finest black, which is just as permanent and beautiful as the Parisian, and which has the great advantage over the other in that linen and clothing may be dyed in cold water, so that there is no danger of burning, as is seen in the case of other dyes. First, one takes water and boils in it the bark of the alder, into which solution the cloth is dipped, or, as they here say, it is prepared for being dyed (beta). Afterwards, one takes as much of the black mud as of the bark and boils them together for a proper time, and lets it cool; and when one draws the same cloth through it, then one has the black color which is beautiful and permanent. The cloths which were dyed black many years ago are found to have kept their color up to the present day. Furthermore, it is said that in this place there is a healthful and lovely air, which is considered to come from the three salubrious springs. Those who dwell in the vicinity insist that for the last fifty years they have not known of any cattle having died from sickness, nor any ailment in man or beast.

There is little proper geologic information in this account; but notice the wide-awake alertness with which he observes the facts, and his keen interest in following out their bearings upon the useful arts. His interest and his information seemed to have no bounds.

We now pass to larger geological considerations, especially to questions of historical geology. Swedenborg was much impressed with the evidences of the action of water remote from the seashore and high above the sea level. He observed on the mountain sides strata of sedimentary rock, and huge boulders scattered over the surface of the earth. With characteristic boldness, he began to theorize as to the causes. With the evidence before him it was natural that he should imagine the earth to have been once covered with water mountain high; and as it never occurred to him to question the literal truth of the Bible, he connected this high water with Noah's Flood. He nevertheless suspected that there might have been other floods, partial or otherwise. At any rate, he went industriously to work to extend his observations, and to draw from them what seemed to him the natural conclusions. His mind went back to the conditions of the primæval world, and imagined what would be the effects of a deep primæval ocean which raged above the hills and mountains. He studied the moving power of water, and the laws of hydrostatics. His general idea was that the waters of the ocean had gradually subsided and exposed more and more of the land, leaving behind traces of violent action and steadily lowering levels.

During the period from 1717 to 1720, while he was making his geological observations, he wrote two articles to set forth his interpretations and conclusions. The first was a paper of some 25 pages entitled, as translated into English, "On the Height of Water and the Strong Tides in the Primæval World." This was afterwards condensed in a letter of four pages to Jacob Melle, 1721. These were re-

markable geological treatises. Jacob Berzelius, styled the father of modern chemistry, said of the former:

> Emanuel Swedenborg, who became famous in many respects, was the first who called attention in a printed book to a rise of the Swedish coast.

Referring to writers on this subject, he says: "None of these writers with the exception of Swedenborg had made genuine geological examinations." Berzelius also, in a letter to Dr. Wilkinson about the "Animal Kingdom," has this to say:

> I am surprised at the great knowledge displayed by Swedenborg in a subject that a professed metallurgist would not have been supposed to have made an object of study, and in which, as in all he undertook, he was in advance of his age.

Swedenborg enumerates and discusses in this book more than seventeen proofs that Sweden was at one time for the most part under water; and he also took these as proofs of a primæval ocean and of the Deluge. His attitude is well expressed in the preface, and this is perhaps the first instance where Swedenborg brings his science and his religion together. The preface is short and is as follows:

> From the Word of God we have the first knowledge of the universal Flood, which covered all the four parts of the world like an ocean, and destroyed all the previously created work of God, together with all animated things which existed on the dry ground. And had not Noah been provided with a new machine, wherewith to move on the surface of the waters, all that had life on it would have been destroyed in the Flood before mentioned, and the memory of it would for all times have been effaced, and the earth upon which we now live would, like another abandoned planet, have circled around its sun without containing anything more remarkable upon its surface than a Mars or a Jupiter does. There is no one who denies that this universal Flood covered the earth; but worldly wisdom is not content with this fact, but wishes also to have a word to say in the matter; therefore she investigates and gathers proofs from the things which the Flood has left behind. To this, curiosity has also led my thoughts, encouraged also by the idea that it furnishes corroboration of the truth, and as it were contains its own praise and recommendation. And as I know that

it will serve to corroborate the Word of God and the truth, I entertain the hope that what I have, with the kindest intentions, asserted and pointed out, may be interpreted by others with equal kindness. At least, this will be gained, that workers in southern countries, who have labored on this problem, will find clearer proofs and traces from our North than they themselves possess.

First, he takes the case of Mount Kinnekulle, to the west of Lake Wener and between Billingen and Hunneberg north and south. He describes the mountain as to its general appearance, its position, the air, climate, and fertility of its broad top; and then goes on to give the particulars of its geological structure, with a theory of its original formation. Of the position, geological structure, and mode of formation, he says:

The most remarkable thing concerned with our subject is that Kinnekulle lies between Hunneberg and Billingen, as a castle between two walls; also that it consists of many layers of stone, at the bottom of granite, then of different kinds of lime and potstone, and then of brown, blue and black slate. From Kinnekulle we have the clearest proofs as well of the immense height of the waters above our North, as of their strong agitation in days past; for if one from Kinnekulle takes a general view from every side, no opening is seen except on both sides of the before mentioned mountains; on one side is a wider gap, on the other a narrower, where Maseberg has placed itself across over against it. If now the whole visible tract (which will be demonstrated better later on) has stood under water, one may notice how the ocean was able to strike the mountains along the ridge, and was kept back, and between them created a calm; how it also was able to flow and rush in through the openings and then collided in the central point where Kinnekulle is now situated; and thus how it carried all its mud, gravel, sand, and stone, and left it as a ballast, and thus laid as well the foundation as the structure of the great Kinnekulle, which is now a monument to the height of the Flood, and to the gathering of the waters between the said walls.

That the before mentioned Kinnekulle has flown together from the waters striking on two sides can hardly be denied: First, there is a root underneath with a diameter of about one (Swedish) mile, which consists of limestone (lim-och Kalk-sten), on top of which lie many horizontal layers of other kinds of stone, until by degrees it rises steeply upwards to the top, which is like the top

of a pyramid cut off at a convenient place; it is evident that a muddy sea has entered between the gaps, (the waters of which) have collided and deposited here a layer of sand, there a layer of clay and lime, which has hardened to limestone, in other places other kinds of mud and salty clays, which have turned into slate, of which the upper part of Kinnekulle consists; and all this in horizontal planes, forming also round-shaped sides; from which it may be concluded that the sea there flowed together, and that the ridges round (the center) kept the waves back and thus rendered the waters inside calm, so that all this mud was enabled to settle properly.

This statement is worth close study both from the historical point of view and from the point of view of scientific method. Geologists now have different theories about the formation of mountains, and no doubt with further and wider observation and investigation Swedenborg would have modified his theory. His geological observations were presumably accurate, and it is plain that he recognized the geological principle that through the action of water successive layers of sedimentary material were superposed one upon the other gradually, and thus were formed the geological strata. Swedenborg's explanation is mechanically clear, and it shows a ready command of a constructive imagination, and a grasp of precise scientific method.

With his usual breadth of observation he speaks of "similar heights and hills in other places," and adds other details to fortify his theory. He also speaks of the pleasure it has often given him to observe with his own eyes how this happened. Here, it seems, he was watching the actual operations of nature.

Next he proceeds to a set of proofs offered by the arrangement of mountains and ridges in a north and south direction. This is one of the observations which it seems that Swedenborg was the *first* to make in any systematic way. He accounted for the arrangement by the flow of the tides and the east and west direction of the winds. He extended his observations to sand ridges, to limestone and chalk ridges, and to ridges formed by great boulders. In

all these cases, he saw the action of water, and evidences of a primæval ocean which submerged the earth to the mountain tops.

Another evidence of the action of water was the widespread occurrence of smooth round stones, which were found at all levels above the sea. In some cases he seems to be describing glacial action. Then he cites the evidence from water lines, strata of earth and stone, and potholes. He observes layers of granite superposed upon limestone.

We should try to bear constantly in mind that Swedenborg was a pioneer in geological observation. His interest and his observations seem to have been maintained and directed by a native scientific curiosity that was insatiable. It would be a valuable piece of historical work to collect his geological observations, and put them in systematic order. We can only give suggestions of the kind of work he did, together with some of his reflections and interpretations.

One of the proofs of the primæval ocean and its action which very much impressed his mind was the formation of layers of earth and stone in the crust of the earth. What he says about this is a good specimen of his geologizing. He says under Proof VIII:

> It is also interesting to see how the crust of the earth is divided up into many kinds of layers: first the mountain, then the stone on top of it, then different kinds of sand, and finally clay and soil. In many cases, we find whole plains covered with sand, equally distributed all over them, which must have been washed together by water, then also more clay to the depth of many fathoms, which can have been conveyed thither only by the sea. At Helsingborg, there are also several layers of stone and earth; lowermost, we find brown stone, then red stone, and then granite; on top of this, sandstone of a fathom's thickness, and then layers of slate, white, brown, blue, and black; on top of this, a layer of coal; then a blue slate-like stone, which dissolves in water and is full of salt like the sea. Of such combinations, whole areas are made up, occupying almost a fourth of Westergyln; whole ridges, as Billingen; whole hills, as Kinnekulle. From which it may be concluded that it has been accumulated by the flowing and falling of the sea, when one

layer must of necessity have been obliged to place itself on top of the other, and successively deposited mud and clays, in which the water itself has left impressions, having stored up therein heaps of fishes, snails and crustacea, and in order the better to preserve them against time, has petrified them. Of these layers of earth and stone, the celebrated Vice-President and Archiatern, Dr. Urban Hierne, has brought together many things of general interest, to which he has added some learned comments.

Here we have a statement of the geological theory of the formation of the earth's crust, with water as the principal agent; also observations upon the order in which the strata were superposed. We have also suggestions as to the origin of the materials of the several strata: he distinguishes soil, clay, slate, sandstone, limestone, granite, and other varieties. But the scientific character of his work consists in his weaving the observations together under the theory of the action of a primæval ocean. The facts suggested to him that the level of the sea had changed, and that the waters of the Deluge had gradually subsided. Another alternative was of course possible: the same effects would have been produced by the elevation of the land. But the idea of the surface of the solid earth rising and falling is very remote from the common experience of mankind. On the other hand, the rise of water in floods and tides is a very familiar phenomenon, and this together with the tradition of the Deluge seemed to Swedenborg sufficient for his hypothesis. The considerations which have led geologists to the theory of the rise and fall of the earth's crust are highly complicated, and rest on observations and inferences involving long stretches of time.

As an illustration of Swedenborg's minute observation and of his freedom in theorizing, we may take what he says about layers of granite on top of limestone:

There are also entire granite mountains on top of deep layers consisting of limestone, and at the top of Kinnekulle granite is found covering it; at the top of Billingen, the crest and the steep wall consist of granite only; under it, however, limestone is found all the way down to the bottom, in which fishes and insects are

concealed. One must therefore arrive at the conclusion that granite has also been a fine mud, which having been deposited at the bottom, has hardened to stone, though in it there are never any animals to be found, as in other kinds of stone. Otherwise, it is evident that they have, at the beginning been soft, have been worn by the wave, ground and polished by the sand, and chiseled out by stones; in a word filed off on all edges, and in some cases they have been broken and scattered about; in a word, they have been formed according to the pleasure of wave and wind.

What Swedenborg observed in the above cases was the outcropping of the granite through the layer of limestone as the result of denudation and erosion. It naturally seemed to him that the granite was superposed. He was quite correct in the observation that there were fossils in the limestone but not in the granite. His theory of the origin and composition of granite was a bold exercise of the scientific imagination. Whether the theory in the last analysis was correct or not, it is hard to say; granite is a metamorphic rock of very complicated structure, and the description may fit some stages of the process. In any case the theory was such as to provoke further investigation, and this is an important scientific character.

Another instance of Swedenborg's painstaking observation and scientific theorizing is his explanation of potholes. He describes "round drilled holes in the mountains which have a diameter of from two to three feet, and a depth of from two to three ells." He shows that the location in these cases is such that "the water must have swirled and formed a whirlpool in these places"; and worn and drilled holes. He notes that it is the nature of water "to eat itself into the hardest stone." He adds that "if stones have happened to lodge in these whirlpools, they have been carried around and ground against the sides, and thus widened the hole more and more." He concludes the description by citing other instances in different parts of the country in a characteristic way, as follows:

I have found two such holes in hard granite at Gullmarsberg;

several at Stromstad, one very near the town, over which hangs a cliff, having a large crevice, in which a great many round and polished stones have been found. These holes are called potholes, and have also been found in Lapland by Professor and Doctor Rudbeck, which (discovery) will be mentioned in his account of his trip to Lapland, especially one instance where the water has drilled a hole clear through the cliff. At Trollhatt River, three are to be found situated many fathoms higher than the stream now flows. From which it may be concluded that said stream now flows lower than formerly, and that Venner has more and more deepened itself, and may in time cut deeper still and provide space for more neighbors to dwell upon.

Swedenborg found further evidences of the action of the waters of the primæval ocean in the occurrence of fossils, such as large fish bones, mussels, snails, etc., high up on the mountain sides. As further "convincing proofs of the flood of the ancient world," he notes that "in many places they are found 50 fathoms above the sea," and that "the mussels have formed a whole tract of land 200 paces in length and five to six in depth, and they have formed such a solid mass that the inhabitants burn it into lime." "No one with sound reason will deny that this has been thrown up by the sea." He puts his conclusion in these words:

A tidal wave has swept over the world, which has brought all these things together, placing one layer on top of another, and thus making a hill by collecting the materials. For should the ocean stand still over its abyss 1000 years, such large hills and so many layers could never have been accumulated, had they not been brought together by wind and wave, or by tides, to cause the water to rise and fall alternately, and at every rising leave one layer on top of the other.

Arguing further with geological interest and significance, he continues:

Besides, there are in Westergyln, in the parish of Starcke, in Stora Dahla, so also everywhere on Billingen and elsewhere, 12 miles from the ocean, other sea animals, swimming animals, and wonderful insects, which are quite hidden, and are changed into stone; indeed, they often lie in the mountain itself, but mostly in the limestone and between the shale. Of these the experienced

Professor of Anatomy in Stockholm, Doctor Bromell, possesses a rich and curious collection, which will likely be completed soon and shown to the public. What may be concluded from this with certainty is that stone and shale in the time of the above mentioned Flood was nothing else than mud, sediment, clay, and sand, since fishes have been inclosed in it and insects have been deposited. When the above mentioned Professor's Swedish petrifactions are exhibited, the truth of this will be still less open to denial.

Geology has adopted these observations and interpretations. The science of geology has been built up on the study of these successive layers of mud, clay, sand, sandstone, limestone, in the formation of the rocks, and upon the inferences to be drawn from this succession. We should appreciate that Swedenborg was working for the most part independently, as a solitary pioneer, and that he was laying solid foundations for systematic work in the science which has become one of the greatest achievements of the human intellect.

The above extracts are sufficient to indicate the scientific character of Swedenborg's work at a time when geology was only in its beginnings, when materials were being collected, but not as yet given systematic form. Further quotation would only re-enforce the impression so far made; but to show the breadth and variety of his treatment, we may enumerate the remaining considerations upon which he relied to establish his position. In a word, he saw evidences of the height of water and the strong tides of the primæval world, in the occurrence of large fish bones far inland, from inland seas and their fishes, from the remnants of ships found far inland, from the uneven shape of the ground, from steep, empty river beds, from black soil superposed upon sand, clay, and gravel, from the annual falling of the Baltic, from the allotment of land and water in Sweden, from the evidences that Sweden was once an island, and from the change of the northern horizon. Each of these topics is developed on the basis of observation and reasoning which is characteristic and impressive.

Passing now to the letter to Jacob Melle, it is only necessary to say that all the preceding arguments are rehearsed and briefly stated, in a way to secure attention and carry conviction. In this letter Swedenborg pays a handsome tribute to co-workers in the field of geology. Melle was an educated man of scholarly tastes and abilities, and something of a scientist. It appears that he made Swedenborg a present of his recent book on Figured Stones found in the vicinity of Lubeck. The first paragraph of the letter is interesting as naming the men of his acquaintance who were at that time making geological collections. "I greatly rejoice," he says, "that the researches of the learned are everywhere bringing to light at the present day so many important evidences of the existence of a primæval ocean." Then he goes on to mention as "our most distinguished collectors," Dr. John Hesselius, Provincial Physician; Dr. Magnus Bromell, Assessor of the College of Mines; and Dr. Lawrence Roberg, Professor of Medicine in the University of Upsala. With the exception of these citations, Swedenborg does not seem to have been much interested in the history of geology. Although he refers occasionally to geological observations and conditions in other countries, he does not give the names of those who were doing or had done work in that field. His work in geology is interesting and important from the historical and scientific point of view; but our interest in it for the moment is to get an insight into his prepossessions and mental habits, and in general into his personality as a scientist. His extended and careful geological observations were probably the spontaneous outcome of his disposition to observe and to interpret. But no doubt his scientific energies were stimulated and directed by the philosophic motive of working out and grounding his theory of the primæval ocean. He accepted implicitly the account of the Flood given in the Bible, and he inferred from the evidence before him that Sweden had been at one time under water, while his cosmological views

led him to think that there must have been at the beginning a primæval ocean which submerged the whole earth. He held these two ideas with equal tenacity, but the primæval ocean tended more and more to be independent and of major scientific importance. So that this is the idea that is most constantly in his mind, although he did not doubt that the Noachic Flood had its own part to play. Another leading motive to geological observation was Swedenborg's interest in mines and mining, and his official position as mining engineer and superintendent. This led him to make an exhaustive study of everything connected with mining, and among other things the geographical and geological situation of mines. We see constant evidence that much of his scientific work had this origin.

The geological papers of this period seem to have been preliminary, and intended especially to support the theory of a primæval ocean. Most of the work in preparation for the writing was done in 1717 and 1718. Then Swedenborg turned for a while to the field of physics, especially to chemistry, and in 1721, he brought out his first sketch of the Principles of Natural Philosophy, devoted mainly to the study and discussion of the theory of particles. This work was the result of a good deal of systematic study of physics and chemistry, both experimental and theoretical. It shows that, while he was making his geological observations, he was at the same time studying and reflecting upon the constitution of nature in general, and especially upon the nature and behavior of the ultimate particles of physical bodies. After finishing this sketch, he returned for a while to his studies in geology; at least he devoted to this subject Part I of the "Miscellaneous Observation," published in 1722.

Lewis F. Hite.

EARLY INFLUENCE OF SWEDENBORG IN EUROPE

By Clarence Hotson, Ph.D.

UNLIKE most innovators in religion, Swedenborg made no attempt to make proselytes otherwise than through the publication and distribution of his writings, and to some extent in private conversation when someone else had taken the initiative. He believed in the power of the press, and greatly appreciated the liberty of the press which existed in England and Holland, but which did not exist in his native Sweden. His choice of Amsterdam and London as the places for publishing his books is significant for this reason.

Fifty copies of "Conjugial Love" were confiscated at a custom-house in Sweden, May 1, 1769, by order of Bishop Filenius, the Bishops particularly being for the most part bitterly opposed to Swedenborg's doctrines, which they made no attempt to understand.[1]

The clergy in England, Holland, and Sweden, especially in the higher ranks, as might be expected, paid no attention to his gifts of books, except to oppose their supposed tendency. Swedenborg, with characteristic conservatism and love of orderly procedure, hoped, apparently, for good results by appealing first to the authorities of the various national churches, not excepting even the Roman Catholic prelates. In all such efforts he was, apparently, unsuccessful.[2]

From a comment in the "Spiritual Diary" for August 27, 1748, it appears that he expected to have five sorts of readers:

---

[1] R. L. Tafel, Documents Concerning Swedenborg, II: 306, 313, 710, 1005; *New Church Life*, 1896: 186.

[2] Documents, II: 468, 532, 989.

The first will reject my writings entirely, either because they are of a different persuasion, or are enemies of the faith: they cannot be received by these, whose minds are impenetrable.

The second will receive them as scientifics and be delighted with them as curiosities.[3]

The third will receive them intellectually, and with readiness, but their lives will remain unaltered by them.

The fourth will receive them in a persuasive manner, allowing them to penetrate to amendment of life: to this class they will occur in certain states and do good service.

The fifth will receive them with joy, and reduce them to practice. (Diary, n. 2955.)

In later years, when his name became known as that of the author of the various books he had published, many more copies were sold. Even "Arcana Cœlestia" had been sold out in Holland and England by 1771, and "Conjugial Love" was much in demand in Paris and many parts of Germany in 1769. The "Brief Exposition" spread throughout Christian Europe, Sweden alone excepted. This success of his works was chiefly, however, the effect of mere curiosity. Few even of the readers professed their acceptance of his teachings. Swedenborg once told General Tuxen that he did not know more than about fifty persons who favored his doctrine.[4]

The first disciple officially persecuted for spreading his doctrine was the prelate Oetinger, of Wuertemberg, who was called to trial before Duke Charles March 4, 1766, and whose work "Swedenborgs und anderer Irdische und Himmlische Philosophie," Frankfort, 1765, was confiscated as heretical.[5]

Among enthusiastic admirers in Scandinavian countries were Augustus and Charles Frederic Nordenskjöld, and the Danish General Tuxen. The most prominent disciples in Sweden were Count Höpken, Dr. Gabriel Beyer, Pro-

---

[3] For Swedenborg's explanation of what he meant by "scientifics," see Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 10,025-10,033.

[4] Documents, II: 275, 440.

[5] Documents, II: 977, 1029, 1032.

fessor of Greek in Gothenburg University, and Dr. Johan Rosén, Professor of Eloquence and Poetry in the same university. Beyer and Rosén became personally acquainted with Swedenborg in 1765, and were perhaps his earliest disciples. Both stood trial for heresy before the Consistory of Gothenburg, the trial continuing for an entire year, 1769-1770. Their enemies could not get them deprived of office, but succeeded in obtaining for them the royal censure and restricting them in their duties. Rosén promised to "keep silence" but he would not recant.[6]

Dr. Beyer wrote several explanatory treatises in his advocacy of Swedenborg's doctrines, and prepared a voluminous index of his master's works, most valuable to later students, published in Amsterdam, 1779, the work of thirteen years. He died when this work was done.[7]

The greatest sufferer in Sweden was Reverend Doctor Sven Schmidt, a clergyman in the diocese of Skara, who, persisting in his refusal to recant Swedenborg's doctrine as heresy, was suspended in 1773, but afterward reinstated, only to be imprisoned in 1776, so that he remained in jail for two years. In 1779 he was confined for the rest of his life in an insane asylum, where he died in 1805.[8]

Johan Tybeck, born 1751, ordained in 1779 in the Lutheran Church, was converted to Swedenborg's teaching in 1780. From 1788 to the end of his life he published various tracts. In 1818, in his sixty-sixth year, he was tried for heresy, and, though acquitted by the civil authorities, was removed April 15, 1818, from his pastorate by the Consistory of Strengnäs. His advocacy of his views became only the more vigorous. He died in 1837. During his later years he was recognized as the patriarch of the New Church in Sweden, and was called the "bishop of the

---

[6] Documents, I; 620, 639; II: 283-386; 699, 707, 1001; *New Church Life*, 1895, 183; *New-Church Messenger*, 58: 43, 59.

[7] Documents, II: 262, 320; 700.

[8] Article by C. Th. Odhner, in *New-Church Messenger*, March 19, 1890.

Swedenborgians." He was allowed to write and publish, but not to organize separatist congregations.[9]

A notable Swedish convert was Baron Leonard Gyllenhall, who, born in 1752, was converted by his kinsman, Professor Wahlfeldt, while a student at Skara in 1770. He studied under Linnæus at Upsala. He entered the army and rose to the rank of major, but resigned his commission in 1799, and studied thereafter the natural sciences. He was considered the greatest Swedish entomologist of his age. He was a member of the "Exegetic-Philanthropic Society" and of the secret New-Church society "Pro Fide et Charitate," each organized in turn to study and propagate Swedenborg's teachings. After the secret society was extinguished, he continued his activity as the principal supporter of Reverend Johan Tybeck, in defraying the expense of his many publications. After Gyllenhall's death, Dr. A. Kahl, the authority for these statements, discovered in his library a number of important documents regarding Swedenborg.

Among Swedes who advocated these doctrines and helped to propagate them were the brothers Augustus and Charles Frederic Nordenskjöld. Augustus Nordenskjöld published in 1784 a weekly periodical, "Aftonbladet," which after eight months of life was killed by clerical opposition: the earliest Swedenborgian periodical.[10] Other notable early disciples in Sweden include C. L. Schönherr, Councilor of Commerce, Christopher Springer, and Charles B. Wadström, an early anti-slavery man. Arvid Ferelius, pastor of the Swedish Church in London, from whose hands Swedenborg received the communion shortly before his death, was also favorable, but not openly.[11]

---

[9] Documents, II: 1278; *Intellectual Repository,* 1820; *New-Church Messenger,* January, 1897.

[10] *New-Church Messenger,* December, 1896.

[11] Documents, I: 646, 704; II: 538, 558, 563, 576-8; *New-Church Messenger,* January, 1897; *New Jerusalem Magazine,* London, 1790, 70.

Reverend Jonas P.. Odhner, dean of Lyrestad (1744-1830) was one of the few Lutheran clergymen in Sweden who fearlessly and openly confessed the new faith during the period of persecution. One of the earliest converts in Sweden, he was the first to translate "True Christian Religion" into Swedish.[12]

Though persecution was relaxed, and the right to publish and even, eventually, to separate from the State church was achieved, Swedenborg's teaching has never flourished to any great extent in Sweden. The authority for its early history is Professor Robert Sundelin's "Swedenborgianismens Historia i Sverige," Upsala, 1886.

Baron de Breteuil, at one time French ambassador to Sweden, and minister to Louis XVI, was one of Swedenborg's personal friends, and also his disciple. The Marquis de Thomé translated some of Swedenborg's writings into French, as did also M. Moët, Royal Librarian at Versailles, and M. Perault, and published them. Jean Frederic Oberlin, eminent pastor and philanthropist, was likewise a convert.[13]

The first fervent New-Church apostle in France, however, was Captain Jean Jacques Bernard (1791-1828), an army officer, who was wounded at Leipzig, and became a member of the Legion of Honor. In 1820 he embraced the teachings of Swedenborg as soon as he by chance came upon some of the writings, and enthusiastically propagated them, making converts of prominent persons, who included Edouard Richer, Madame de Saint Amour, of Nantes, and M. Oegger, confessor to the Queen.[14]

---

[12] Odhner, Annals of the New Church, I: 368.

[13] Documents, II: 1162; Hindmarsh, Rise and Progress, 181; *New Jerusalem Magazine*, 43: 643; *Intellectual Repository*, 1856: 143; D. Goyder's History, 85-6; *New Jerusalem Magazine*, 13: 266; *Intellectual Repository*, 1840: 151-162; 1864: 211.

[14] *Intellectual Repository*, 1823: 266; 1828: 62; Hindmarsh, Rise and Progress, 386; *New Jerusalem Magazine*, 31: 462-3; Mrs. Ehrenberg, Letters from France, I, 106; *Intellectual Repository*, 1829: 687.

Abbé François Ledru, a parish priest of Leves, near Chartres, France, was converted in 1830, and was ejected from his cure by the bishop of Chartres in 1832 for his Swedenborgianism. His parishioners went in a body to the bishop to plead for his reinstatement, but in vain. The Abbé then opened an independent place of worship for what he called the "French Catholic Church." The bishop had a body of troops sent against him to arrest him, but the inhabitants of Leves and the adjoining villages rose in arms, and the soldiers refused to act against the people. A larger force was sent, a solemn investigation was instituted, and Ledru was acquitted of the charges preferred against him. After his death, August 26, 1837, the movement he had begun collapsed.[15]

M. Le Boys des Guays began November 18, 1837, to conduct New-Church worship in Saint-Amand, France. Within a month he attracted 120 persons. In 1838 a new society was formed at Paris, where there were some twenty converts. In the same year Le Boys des Guays started a monthly magazine, *La Nouvelle Jerusalem,* which was sharply attacked by the Papal organ, *L'Echo du Vatican.* At the same time he launched a New-Church tract society. In 1841 he began to publish a French translation of "Arcana Cœlestia." Yet by 1844 little progress had been made. In 1848 there were about fifty converts in Paris, and twenty-five in Saint-Amand. The French translations did good service in helping to spread the doctrines in the island of Mauritius, beginning around 1850.[16]

In Germany likewise growth was exceedingly slow. The most notable convert was Professor J. F. Immanuel Tafel, a distinguished scholar, who devoted his life to the literary work of the New Church. September 24, 1825, he was appointed professor at the University of Tübingen, on

[15] *Intellectual Repository,* 1838: 323, 325.

[16] *Intellectual Repository,* 1838: 94, 332-8; 1839: 670; 1845: 152; 1865: 125-6; *New Jerusalem Magazine,* 11: 445; 12: 69; 18: 130; 22: 29.

condition that he should refrain from publishing and propagating the writings of Swedenborg. He endured this condition until March, 1829, "lying," as he said, "dead for three years and a half."[18] In 1839 he published, at Tübingen, his important "Collection of Documents respecting Emanuel Swedenborg."

October 1, 1848, as a result of the religious liberty granted by the National Congress in Frankfort, the first general conference of the New Church in Germany was held at Cannstadt, near Stuttgart. Professor Tafel was elected President of the meeting. In the same place assemblies of the New Church of Germany and Switzerland were held, April 5 and September 30, 1849, at which he also presided. The political reaction brought with it renewed persecution.[19]

In Austria, at Warnsdorf, in Bohemia, in May, 1845, Dr. Mach, a leader of a Swedenborgian circle in the town, was arrested and imprisoned in chains, on the charge of being a disturber in religion.[20]

In England, however, where the press was free, and where from the start there was wide toleration of dissenting worship, the greatest growth occurred. Lewis's advertisement of numbers of the "Arcana Cœlestia" in 1749 had the effect of interesting Stephen Penny, who read the portion first published, and from Dartmouth, October 15, 1749, wrote the publisher an appreciative letter, speculating as to the ingenious author's identity.[21]

Penny published in 1769 the first New-Church "collateral" work. He seems to have interested William Cookworthy, a chemist, an active member of the Society of Friends of Plymouth, who in turn interested Reverend

---

[18] *Intellectual Repository*, 1825: 565; Documents, II: 1333.

[19] *Intellectual Repository*, 1848: 411; 1849: 277; 1850: 115.

[20] *New Jerusalem Magazine*, 18: 444.

[21] *New Church Life*, 1893: 171. 188; 1894: 13; 1895: 73, 86, 90; Documents, II: 498.

Thomas Hartley, M. A., Rector of Winwick, Northamptonshire.[22]

Cookworthy in part translated from the original Latin, in 1770, Swedenborg's "Influx," and when it was revised by Hartley, had it published in the same year at his own expense by the Friends' bookseller, James Phillips, of George Yard, Lombard Street, London.[23] Similarly, a translation of "Heaven and Hell," revised by Hartley, was printed in quarto in 1778, at Cookworthy's expense. Cookworthy and Hartley were among the few Englishmen who were personally acquainted with Swedenborg.[24]

A most zealous and influential early disciple of Swedenborg in England was Reverend John Clowes, M. A., for sixty-two years Rector of St. John's Church, Manchester, who is described by Thomas De Quincey as "The holiest of men whom it has been my lot to meet."[25] Richard Houghton, of Liverpool, a man of fortune who read Swedenborg in the original Latin, having become interested through Cookworthy's and Hartley's translation of "Influx," a copy of which he found at Bath, brought Swedenborg's writings to Clowes' attention in 1773. Clowes' conversion was produced by reading *"Vera Christiana Religio"* in October, 1773. He translated almost the whole of the theological works into English—a stupendous task —and openly advocated the ideas he derived from them.[26] Increased interest resulted from his preaching; and reading groups arose to study Swedenborg's writings, the first

[22] J. Bayley, New Church Worthies, 42-49; Documents, II: 996, 1166, 1172; *New Church Life,* 1895: 86, 90; Biography of Penny, Theodore Compton, London, 1895; *Intellectual Repository,* 1825: 443.

[23] Documents, II: 1010; Hyde, Bibliography, 1006, 2450.

[24] Documents, II: 1172; Hindmarsh, Rise and Progress, 21; *New Church Life.* 1895: 135, 151, 159; Documents, II, 539; Documents, I: 3, 10, 599.

[25] Compton, Life of Clowes, 75; *Tait's Magazine,* February, 1837; *Intellectual Repository,* 1837: 500.

[26] Compton, Life, 16, 24-27, 37.

one at Whitefield, near Manchester (1778), a second at Bolton (1781), followed by Radcliffe (1783) and Eccles (1785).[27] Though a priest of the Established Church, Clowes did not lose his position, being protected, when accused of heresy, by a Bishop of liberal views, his superior. In his work of translation Clowes had the help of Reverend Thomas Hartley, who died in 1784, aged 77 years.[28]

In 1784 the first Swedenborgian Sunday school was established at Whitefield, Lancashire. The Manchester Printing Society, established in 1782 by Clowes' disciples, published the English translations which Clowes made.[29]

Samuel Crompton, inventor of the "spinning mule," was converted in 1787, and helped to found the society at Bolton. Hargreaves, of Blackburn, who invented the "spinning jenny," Highs, of Leigh, who constructed the water frame, and Crompton, who combined their inventions in his, were all disciples of Swedenborg.[30]

Early English disciples included a number of physicians; Dr. H. Messiter, Swedenborg's physician and friend, and Dr. William Spence, who was one of the small party that first met in London, December 5, 1783, for study of Swedenborg's writings. He later assisted in the publication of "Apocalypse Explained."[31] Other early disciples in England were Benedict Chastanier, a French physician, who translated some of Swedenborg's works into French; Henry Peckitt, a retired physician and apothecary, who paid the

[27] Hindmarsh, 200; *Intellectual Repository*, I: 92; 1871: 160; *Magazine of Knowledge*, I, 461; Compton, Life, 24-28; *Aurora*, I, 137, 318; Hindmash, 162.

[28] *Aurora*, II: 351; Hindmarsh, 21; *Monthly Observer*, London, 1857-65; I: 177; *Intellectual Repository*, 1850: 209, 400; Documents, I: 599; Biography, *New Church Life*, 1895: 135, 151, 159.

[29] *Aurora*, I: 318; *Intellectual Repository*, 1857: 341-2; 1871: 160; Hindmarsh, 7; *New-Church Messenger*, 47: 150.

[30] Documents, II: 522-27; *Intellectual Repository*, 1827: 685; 1860: 77, 130; 1872: 294; *Messenger*, 47: 81; Bayley, New Church Worthies, 11.

[31] Documents, I: 601; II: 522-27, 535; Hindmarsh, 15, 32.

cost of publishing the "Apocalypse Explained;" Peter Provo, another physician, translator of several of the smaller works; Henry Servanté, editor of the first magazine in England devoted to Swedenborgianism: and John Augustus Tulk, a man of fortune, generous with financial aid in propagating the doctrines.[32]

Robert Hindmarsh (1763-1835), "Printer Extraordinary to the Prince of Wales," who was the most notable early disciple with the exception of Clowes, did more than most, by preaching, writing, translating, and expending his none too abundant wealth, to introduce the new doctrines to the world. He was converted in 1782 by reading copies of Hartley's and Cookworthy's translations of "Influx" and "Heaven and Hell," which he borrowed from George Keen, a Quaker. He was then nineteen years old. He began to search out other readers in London, for the purpose of forming a society. In one year he succeeded in finding only three or four beside himself. In 1783 these few assembled in regular meetings every Sunday morning at Hindmarsh's house in Clerkenwell Close, not far from the spot where Swedenborg died, and read the writings in Latin. John Augustus Tulk soon joined them. Then, in response to a public advertisement, five persons met December 5, 1783, at the London Coffee-House on Ludgate Hill, and organized the "Theosophical Society" for the purpose of promoting the doctrines by translating, printing, and publishing the theological writings of Swedenborg.[33]

Their numbers soon increased. To them came notably C. F. Nordenskjold, bringing with him some of Swedenborg's manuscripts. Another notable addition was Mr. James Glen, a Scotchman, who subsequently went to Philadelphia, and there gave in June, 1784, the first public lecture to advocate the teachings of Swedenborg.[34]

---

[32] Documents, II: 1176-7; Hindmarsh, 30; *Intellectual Repository,* III: 515.

[33] Hindmarsh, Rise and Progress of the New Jerusalem Church, 9-11, 14, 15-16, 23-24 ff.

[34] *New Jerusalem Magazine,* 33: 545; Hindmarsh, 17.

Joseph W. Salmon and Ralph Mather, field preachers under John Wesley, became interested through Reverend John Fletcher, and in their enthusiasm undertook a missionary tour of open-air preaching at London, Liverpool, Salisbury, and elsewhere, in 1787, which resulted notably in the conversion of Joseph Proud, a popular Baptist preacher, at Norwich, in 1789. Mather later figured largely in the American beginnings at Philadelphia and Baltimore, and Salmon became Clowes' secretary.[35]

The Theosophical Society was soon in correspondence with disciples of Swedenborg not only in England, but throughout the civilized world. It sent forth public notices of its views, and attracted recruits. Its publishing activity was extensive.[36]

Reverend Jacob Duché, at this time Chaplain to the Asylum for Female Orphans, in St. George's Fields, one of the most eloquent and popular preachers in London, had already, since 1777, embraced the teachings of Swedenborg. By being quite cautious, he managed to retain his position in the Established Church. He had been a highly popular Episcopalian preacher in Philadelphia, where in 1775 he led the American Continental Congress in prayer, but, when it became evident that separation from Great Britain was intended, and when, likewise, a British army occupied Philadelphia, Duché, like most of his Angelican brethren in America, became a Tory or Loyalist, and had to return to England. Long afterward he returned to America, where he died, January 3, 1798. He wrote a preface to the second English edition of "Doctrine of Life," printed by the Manchester society.[37]

Soon in London the question of forming a definite church organization for public worship came to be agitated. John

---

[35] Hindmarsh, 18, 64-66; *Intellectual Repository*, 1826: 349; 1827: 430; 1871: 303; *New Church Life*, 1896: 154; Goyder, History, 97.

[36] Hindmarsh, 24, 27 ff; ch. III to p. 34.

[37] *New Jerusalem Magazine*, 30: 95; 34: 273-4, 276; 38: 620; Hindmarsh, 40.

Clowes, of Manchester, learning of this, came to London to disuade the London group from separation, asking them to wait until the Bishops should reform the Church of England on Swedenborgian doctrines. He was apparently most conservative, as well as highly optimistic. The London group, however, would not wait, and on May 7, 1787, resolved to open a suitable chapel for separate New-Church worship and preaching. A body of doctrines was drawn up by James Glen, and those who signed it constituted themselves the "New Church." They agreed to administer Baptism and the Holy Supper. July 31, 1787, they appointed by lot James Hindmarsh, a former Methodist preacher, father of Robert, to administer the Holy Supper, and to baptize new members, the first of whom was his son Robert. On the same day a "Dissenters' License" was procured from the Government.[38]

Presently the society rented a chapel in Great East Cheap. James Hindmarsh, an experienced preacher, who had in 1786 been converted by his son, was the natural candidate for the preaching office; and on the opening of the chapel on Sunday, January 27, 1788, he preached the sermon to a numerous gathering, which quite filled the new chapel. James Hindmarsh converted Isaac Hawkins, another Methodist preacher, who was called to account by John Wesley and expelled from the Methodist body.[39]

The question of ordination now arose. They decided to choose by lot twelve male members for this office. In marking the twelve winning tickets (there were sixteen in all) Robert Hindmarsh put on one of them, without consulting his brethren, the word "ORDAIN." He himself, drawing last of all, received this ticket, but records that though he did not tell the others of the chosen twelve what he had done, they requested him to read and perform the ceremony

---

[38] Hindmarsh, IV: 54-56; 58, 61; Compton, 48; *Intellectual Repository,* 1873: 237; *New Church Review,* VI: 543.

[39] Hindmarsh, 59-67; 262; *Intellectual Repository,* 1820: 200, 265; 1847: 160.

of ordination. Thereupon he ordained first his father, James Hindmarsh, and afterward Samuel Smith.[40]

This procedure received, a number of years later, the sanction of the English Conference of the New Church, and thus in England all clergymen of the New-Church connection derive their ordination from Robert Hindmarsh. Because he performed the ordination ceremony, though never himself ordained, Robert Hindmarsh heads the list of New-Church ministers in England.[41] James Hindmarsh died, August 18, 1812. (*Intellectual Repository*, I:221.)

Some dispute as to the propriety and wisdom of the separation arose between the disciples of John Clowes in Manchester and vicinity, and the newly separated body in London. Seventy-seven adult members of the London group signed the letter in which they set forth their case, December 7, 1788.[42]

In 1791 the majority of Clowes' disciples in Manchester took similar action, separating likewise, and upon the death of Mr. Clowes, May 29, 1831, most of his parishioners, unable to endure the non-Swedenborgian preaching of his successor in office, similarly withdrew and joined the separated body.[43]

The London Society sent forth, December 7, 1788, a circular letter containing forty-two theological propositions, inviting the faithful who should agree with them to form a general conference for ecclesiastical organization. This Conference was in session from April 13 to 17, 1789, in the chapel in Great East Cheap, London. Individuals were present from eleven different parts of England, and also from Sweden, America, and Jamaica. Conference adopted

[40] Hindmarsh, 70-1.

[41] *Intellectual Repository*, 1835: 415-16; Hindmarsh, 308; Conference Record, 1818.

[42] Hindmarsh, 75-8, 80.

[43] Hindmarsh, 145; *New Church Life*, 1893: 187; *Intellectual Repository*, 1832: 339; 1835: 450; 1831: 453; 1841: 353; Record, Swedenborg Society, 1831.

thirty-two doctrinal resolutions, April 6, 1789. Hindmarsh noted with satisfaction that the increase of numbers of the society since the opening of the Chapel in Great East Cheap was seven times as much in one year as it had been in the four years preceding this opening of the Chapel.[44]

Birmingham and Keighley, Yorkshire, developed societies in the same year, 1789.

Soon periodical publications arose (*The New Jerusalem Magazine,* and *The New Magazine of Knowledge*), some of them short-lived, but doubtless useful in spreading the new gospel. In such efforts Robert Hindmarsh was naturally foremost.[45]

At the Second General Conference, 1790, Joseph Wright and Manoah Sibley were ordained; and shortly thereafter, Reverend Francis Leicester, a former priest of the Church of England.[46]

Joseph Proud, the ex-Baptist preacher whom Salmon and Mather on their preaching tour had converted, composed a volume of hymns for the new body. Mr. Proud, who came to be called "the Swedenborgian orator," when later he preached in London for fourteen years, to an average congregation of one thousand persons,[47] was ordained, and by his eloquence and the beauty of the dress he adopted, gained great attention in Birmingham, where he went to preach, in a new Temple especially built for the New Church in that city, and opened Sunday, June 19, 1791.[48]

Dr. Joseph Priestley, the celebrated Unitarian theological writer and scientist, was present on the opening of the church, and subsequently prepared for the press a pamphlet opposing the Swedenborgian views. The "Tory riots" in July, 1791, prevented him from publishing it. The mob was particularly hostile to Unitarians, some of whom had ex-

---

[44] Hindmarsh, 100-104, 108.

[45] Hindmarsh, 108; Odhner, Life of Robert Hindmarsh, 25-31.

[46] Biography of Leicester, *Magazine of Knowledge,* II: 10.

[47] *Intellectual Repository,* 1826: 347, 351.

[48] Hindmarsh, 128-129.

pressed sympathy with the French Revolution, as a result of which the mob suspected them of hostility to the British crown and institutions. The rioters destroyed Dr. Priestley's house, his library, and his valuable scientific apparatus, together with the manuscript of his anti-Swedenborgian pamphlet, and Dr. Priestley himself was lucky to escape with his life. The rioters then turned to attack the New Jerusalem chapel. Mr. Proud, who lived next door to the church building, with great presence of mind threw some money collected in the service the day preceding, among the mob, and assured them energetically that the minister and worshippers were not Unitarians, and were not opposed to the Government. With a shout, "New Jerusalem for ever!" the Tory mob dispersed.[49]

Though Dr. Priestley subsequently controverted the New-Church doctrines, he never attempted to calumniate Swedenborg by charging him with madness, or with a wilful design to mislead and deceive his readers, nor did he vilify Swedenborg's disciples.[50] He behaved, in short, like a gentleman and a Christian, and far differently in this respect from most of the opponents of the New-Church movement. Priestley later came to America, and settled in Pennsylvania. He helped to found the Unitarian denomination in America.

Though saved from the mob, the Birmingham church did not escape entirely, as it was damaged by a hand grenade, March 10, 1793.[51]

On Sunday, October 16, 1791, a chapel was opened by Mr. Ralph Mather, who was ordained by his congregation, for the New Church in Liverpool. He held weekly meetings both Sundays and Tuesdays. Subsequent, however, to Mather's departure in 1792, for America, the organization in Liverpool was rent by faction and internal dissen-

[49] Hindmarsh, 131 footnote; *New Jerusalem Magazine*, new series, XII, 249; *Morning Light*, 1889: 182.

[50] Hindmarsh, 135.

[51] *New Jerusalem Magazine*, new series, XII: 249.

sion, till in 1826 the members reunited and worked together once more.[52]

The Third General Conference, 1791, transferred ordaining power to the Conference, and ordained Proud and Robert Brand. (Hindmarsh, Rise and Progress, 117-126).

The Fourth General Conference, London, April, 1792, introduced the first serious dissension in the denomination at large. The question of the appointment of ministers, as might be expected, caused trouble, and an Episcopalian party and a Presbyterian party appeared. (Hindmarsh, Rise and Progress, 140-42). The London group separated into two churches. The great majority, favoring "Presbyterianism", chose for their pastor Reverend Manoah Sibley, and worshipped separately. The Hindmarsh faction, a small minority, favoring "Episcopalianism," seceding from Conference, meanwhile went to pieces. April, 1793, saw two separate "Fifth General" Conferences, held by majority and minority factions at Birmingham and London, respectively. The split caused great weakness, that lasted until 1807.[53]

Mr. William Cowherd, curate to Mr. Clowes, was chosen minister by those of the Manchester Society who separated from the Church of England in 1791. He prepared a new liturgy for their use. Having peculiar notions of his own, with which the majority of his first followers did not agree, he left them in 1809, and organized in Salford a society of what he called "Bible Christians." He made total abstinence from alcoholic liquors and from flesh meat an article of religion among them. These "Bible Christians" became independent of Conference and remained so. July 7, 1811, Robert Hindmarsh set up a rival chapel in Salford, which was consecrated September 19, 1813. The ribald jocosely called it the "Beefsteak Chapel."[54]

---

[52] Hindmarsh, 138; *New Church Life,* 1896; 154; Goyder, History, 60-1; Conference Records, 1826: 68.

[53] Hindmarsh, 155-57, 166.

[54] *Intellectual Repository,* I: 257, 493; Hindmarsh, 145, 147-8, 190, 204-208, 493; Goyder, History, 109-10.

By 1795, churches were established in London, Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Bristol, Keighley, Hull, Salisbury, Leeds, Chester, Isle of Wight, Norwich, Dudley, in England, and in Baltimore in America. In 1798, Samuel Noble, who later became a notable New-Church apologist, was converted. (*Intellectual Repository*, 1839: 605.)

Non-separatists continued their efforts in England, and held annual meetings at Hawkstone Park, in Shropshire, from 1806 until 1824, after which for a while they met annually at Warwick, for the purpose of advancing Swedenborg's teachings within the Established Church and in other denominations. By 1808 much better feeling prevailed between separatists and non-separatists.[55]

With the Sixth General Conference, May 6, 1807, Conference became a delegated body. Five ministers attended, and seven delegates, the first appointed to represent the different societies. This Conference ratified the first ordination of ministers, and insisted upon "re-baptism," or "baptism into the New Church." In 1808 William Mason, later prominent, was converted.[56]

"The London Society for Printing and Publishing the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg" was formed in 1810. The "Swedenborg Society" was independent of Conference until recently. It was for many years a catholic body, including both members of the separated New-Church body, and other followers of Swedenborg. The celebrated sculptor, John Flaxman, joined it in 1811. (Record, Swed. Soc. 1811). One of its chief benefactors was the late Reverend Augustus Clissold, M. A., of the Church of England, who, among other benefactions, purchased and presented to the Society the house in Bloomsbury Street from which its publications until recently emanated. It is now (1930) at 20 Hart Street, in a building specially prepared for its use.

The "Swedenborg Association" was formed later, and

---

[55] Hindmarsh, 185; *Intellectual Repository*, 1857; 339; *New Church Magazine*, 1888: 218; Compton, Clowes, 101, 122.

[56] Hindmarsh, 70, 108, 188; *Intellectual Repository*, 1863: 319.

did much work in translating and publishing the philosophic and scientific works of Swedenborg.

In England the opposition to the New-Church movement was nearly all confined to ridicule and pamphleteering. In controversy the disciples of Swedenborg showed themselves quite a match for their opponents. In answer to Reverend G. Beaumont's "The Anti-Swedenborg,"[57] Samuel Noble wrote his famous "Appeal,"[58] which is the chief piece of New-Church polemics or apologetics.

There was of course in England no governmental persecution. At St. Heliers, in Jersey, where, in 1822, Mr. Abraham Jones Le Cras led public worship, the society was disturbed in 1824 by riots and stone throwing, but the police eventually restored order. The small society at Weymouth, near St. Heliers, vainly applied to the mayor for similar protection, for he sympathized with the rioters. In 1827 the New-Church society at St. Heliers was again the object of mob violence, at which the police connived. Captain James Gomm, of the Royal Navy, one of the society's members, who died ten years later at the age of seventy-seven, finally made the authorities keep order.[59]

In Manchester, the local New-Church people opened, in 1827, the "Manchester and Salford New Jerusalem Free Schools." After a time the school became greatly celebrated on account of its excellent work in secular education, received Government support, emancipated itself from the New-Church influence, and became a prominent public school. The New-Church thus led the way in establishing day schools for the common people.[60]

In 1835 Robert Hindmarsh died. His "Rise and Prog-

---

[57] London, Baynes, 142 pp., 1824.

[58] London, 1826, 566 pp; *Intellectual Repository*, 1826: 322.

[59] *Intellectual Repository*, 1822: 201; 1824: 164; 1839: 497; Hindmarsh, 361; *New Jerusalem Magazine*, London, 1827: 317.

[60] *Intellectual Repository*, 1857: 127; *Morning Light*, 1891: 355; Hindmarsh, 475.

ress of the New Jerusalem Church" was not published until 1861.[61]

In England the center of the New-Church movement has always been Lancashire. The number of churches decreases in proportion to the population, according to the distance from this district. Massachusetts in the United States bears much the same relation to the movement as Lancashire does in England. To an overwhelming extent the "New Church" is an English-speaking movement. There are perhaps twenty thousand followers of this faith, at present, in the world.

The number of non-separatists in England and elsewhere is not known, but cannot be particularly large.

It would be a mistake to suppose that because the "New Church" has remained a small body, its influence has been negligible. It has, on the contrary, directly and indirectly, strongly influenced religious thought, and, on the whole, in the direction of more humane, rational, liberal, and at the same time highly philosophic and spiritual ideas. It has done much to break the grip of Calvinism on men's minds, and also to combat the prevailing materialism and naturalism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The New-Church body is not strictly speaking a sect, or a body resulting from a schism in some other body; but a gathering together from within and without other denominations of persons who have found a new faith.

CLARENCE HOTSON, PH. D.
University of Minnesota.

---

[61] *Intellectual Repository*, 1835: 397, 412, 417, 572; *New-Church Repository*, 152; 188; Bayley, New-Church Worthies, 84; Odhner, Life of Robert Hindmarsh, Philadelphia, 1895.

THE UNWRITTEN COMMANDMENTS

By John P. Sutherland, M.D., Sc.D.

COULD any soul have greater desire, greater sincerity and simplicity, greater humility and yearning than are to be found in the words: "Thy hands have made me and fashioned me; give me understanding that I may learn thy commandments" (Psalm cxix, 73)? Is it probable that such a yearning had any relationship to the Decalogue, which is what the majority of people would first think of in this connection? Very evidently not, for the Ten Commandments may be learned, i.e., committed to memory, with but slight effort, and in a very short period of time. They may be not only literally learned, but their inner and deeper meaning may be grasped, to a certain extent at least, by any one possessing a moderate capacity for understanding. The innermost meaning may be beyond the reach of the finite mind in its present stage of development; but are we justified in assuming that this innermost meaning was what the Psalmist had in mind in this longing, heart-felt petition? As a member of a literal-minded race, the Psalmist may possibly have been thinking of the voluminous commandments, ordinances, statutes and precepts to be found in the Law of Moses, and presented to humanity in the Pentateuch. But this idea does not offer a satisfactory interpretation of the prayer. Possibly the Psalmist was inspired to include in his heart-felt desire all the commandments of God, written and unwritten, for it may be assumed there are commandments that have not been written yet by any human scribe.

In regard to the word "commandments," there would seem to be nothing ambiguous or uncertain in its meaning. It is generally assumed to mean that one in authority demands that a certain thing be done or not done, as the case

may be. According to Worcester, commandment means "a mandate, a precept, a law."

It is impressive to note that the words "command," "commanded," "commandment" or "commandments" are used in the Old Testament more frequently than in the New Testament, occurring 700 times in the former, and only 175 times in the latter. And in the latter, instead of the "Law" which was given through Moses, we have the Beatitudes and the Two Great Commandments given by the Lord.

To some minds it may be a little confusing to find that in the 119th Psalm and elsewhere, the words "law," "precepts," "statutes," "commandments," "testimonies," "judgments" should be used so frequently and apparently interchangeably, as if they were synonyms. In this one Psalm, the word "commandments" is used 22 times; the word "law" is used 25 times; the word "precepts," 21 times; "statutes" is used 22 times; "testimonies," 23 times; and "judgments," 19 times. But approximately five hundred years before this Psalm was written Moses wrote:

> Now these are the commandments, the statutes, and the judgments, which the Lord your God commanded to teach you, . . . That thou mightest fear the Lord thy God, to keep all his statutes, and his commandments, which I commend thee. (Deut. vi, 1-2).

In the glorious nineteenth Psalm, beginning, "The heavens declare the glory of God," the Psalmist continues:

> The *law* of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the *testimony* of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The *statutes* of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the *commandment* of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring for ever: the *judgments* of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.

We are told that Moses gave the Decalogue to the children of Israel approximately 1500 B. C.; but Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph lived during the five hundred years before Moses. By what commandments, statutes, laws, etc., were their lives governed? Communication with Jehovah was more direct and immediate, as well as mediate through the Angel of the Lord, in their days, and that may

have been sufficient; or, possibly, they were familiar with the Book of Jasher or some other collection of Writings and Commandments wherein they found guiding rules of life.

Humanity, however, lived for ages before Abram was taken by Terah, his father, out from Ur of the Chaldees, and before the Lord directed Abram to start on his journey to Canaan. And how about the Patriarchs, the peoples and the Churches that antedated Abram? Noah, Lamech, Enoch, Enos, Seth and Adam,—by what commandments, precepts and statutes were their lives guided? That guidance was needed is more than suggested in Genesis vi where we are told that "the wickedness of man was great in the earth," and "it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth." As to Noah, however, we read that "Noah, being a just man, walked with God," and God talked to the humanity represented by Noah, and "thus did Noah; according to all that God commanded, so did he." And in the fifth chapter of Genesis, verses 22 and 24, we are told that Enoch also "walked with God"; and Enoch "was not; for God took him." But long before the days of Noah and Enoch "the Lord God commanded the man he had made, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shall not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

That the later man needed written commandments is evidenced plainly by the voluminous and detailed laws, ordinances, precepts, statutes and commands found throughout the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy.

It is not man alone, however, that is under the domain of law and commandments. The material universe, in its mighty whole and in its smallest part is governed by definite and very specific commandments. Law and order are to be found everywhere; otherwise, chaos. The wind cometh from whence and goeth whither? But from the gentle

zephyr to the destructive tornado, one cannot doubt the wind is guided by laws, whether or not known to man. The Lord commanded the tempest and the sea to be calm, and they were stilled, so that the disciples "marvelled, saying, What manner of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him!" (Matt. viii, 27.)

To the mighty ocean the command has been given, Thus far shalt thou go and no farther.

There is a law, a decree, a command shown through one of the mightiest forces in the universe, the all-pervasive, ever-active gravitational force, that is more illustrative of the omnipresence and omnipotence of the One and Only God than any other of the various forms of energy; the steadying, universal force that holds the planets in their courses, drawing all things unto itself, and even co-ordinating the seemingly chaotic activity of electrons and protons; everywhere present and ever alert, knowing no cessation of activity. And this we read in Psalm cxxi, 3-4: "He that keepeth thee will not slumber. Behold he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep." Such is gravitation with its definite laws.

And so throughout the physical universe, everything is under the domain of law and order—of decrees, statutes and commands. Refraction, reflection, radiation, elasticity, combustion, absorption, diffusion, heat, light and electricity, all under the control of law.

In the wide-reaching and useful field of chemistry, actions and reactions are definite, reliable and always the same. A drop of a solution of silver nitrate added to a solution of salt, or a solution of iodine in a starch solution, produces a well known, easily recognized, unmistakable reaction, always to be depended on. Why? Because of the existence of law. Not an occasional reaction, nor a thousand, nor a million, but times without number will these chemical reactions occur. These actions and reactions are among the reliable and stable things of the physical world. The same dependableness is found in the entire realm of

physics. And why not? According to Psalm cxix, 90-91: "Thou hast established the earth and it abideth. They continue this day according to thine ordinances; for all are thy servants." Commandments there must be and are, whether written or unwritten.

Not only in the inorganic kingdom do we find evidences of law and order. Such evidences abound in the vegetable kingdom, and are increasingly numerous as we get into the animal kingdom.

It is unnecessary to attempt to enumerate the laws . . . unwritten commandments . . . of physics, chemistry, mechanics, electricity, etc. Enough to assume that all the laws of the inanimate world, the inorganic kingdom, are included in the animate, organic kingdom—the higher and more advanced including the lower. Therefore, chemical, physical and electro-magnetic actions and reactions in the organic world behave in the same way—being governed by the same laws—that they do in the inanimate or inorganic world. This idea may be applied, possibly with benefit, to the human body itself, the acme of creation. The application of the idea may perhaps be more easily grasped when we realize that man, *as to his body,* is absolutely of the earth, earthy, having been made of the "dust of the ground," and therefore subject to the specific laws of the inanimate, material world. These laws are more manifest in the nutrition, growth, and repair of the body, than in its higher functions.

As Professor Mather said in his address before the General Convention of the New Jerusalem in June, 1929: "We scientists assume that this is a world of law and order; that every event is the result of law-abiding processes; that each effect is produced by an adequate cause." Apropos of animate nature, he said:

> Here, too, is law and order, but here is something perhaps more important than mere consistency of operation. The scientists of today are becoming more increasingly aware of the presence of realities in the universe that are not susceptible of measurement.

. . . They are spiritual, that is, non-material, non-measurable realities in the life of human beings.

He also called attention to the fact that "the same laws and the same forces which are now utilized in a radio-broadcasting or receiving apparatus were available back in the time of Joshua, but only lately did man discover them."

The same thing is true of so-called vitamins, which have been present in foods since before man appeared on the face of the earth. It was only in 1912, however, that man, through Professor Cassimir Funk, discovered the, even today, unknown somethings called "vitamins."

Unfortunately there has been, even in quite recent days, acrimonious antagonism between those who accepted the teachings of Nature and those whose beliefs and practices were founded on Revelation; an antagonism between Science and Religion. It is interesting to note that most of the "martyrs" in this antagonism have been furnished, not by the Church, but by Science. There must in the nature of things be differences of opinion among men; and interpretations of facts cannot always coincide; but tolerance should displace, and more and more is displacing, bitterness in controversy. Much help in securing amicable and co-operative toleration might be permanently and happily secured by appreciating that the scientist is seeking the truth on the physical plane of life, while the churchman is seeking the truth on the higher, the spiritual plane. This is in keeping with the *fact* that man is a duality; essentially an imponderable personality inhabiting a body of flesh and blood; the latter simply an everchanging material substance, subject to the inexorable, unwritten laws of inanimate Nature; and the former, a spiritual reality, persistent with the stability of immortality, subject to the written Law of Love and the Beatitudes. The difference between the two is greater than that between night and day; and yet temporarily they form a unit.

Modern science, in its expanding acquaintance with Nature, and its understanding of unwritten commandments,

has given mankind very many things that have added enormously to man's comfort, convenience and pleasure; have reduced the hours of labor, mitigated drudgery, and increased his possibilities of industrial production, and in many ways his usefulness to his neighbor. Modern life with its luxuries is greatly indebted to the scientist. But can these things—autos, radios, aeroplanes and other wonderful mechanical things, which are chiefly useful to the flesh and capable of giving fleeting pleasure—satisfy the aspirations and yearnings of the soul? It is not possible to imagine the Psalmist crying "Give me understanding that I may learn the mechanical principles of an auto, a radio, an aeroplane." These are not the things that give and secure lasting happiness, tranquillity of mind, contentment, development of character and personality. Nevertheless the development of the scientific spirit, the desire to know more about Nature and to understand her more thoroughly, has been and is a necessity to the continuous evolution of man.

Throughout the ages intellectual progress has been due to three attributes of Mankind: a deeply implanted, insatiable curiosity; a far-reaching, unrestrainable, unfetterable imagination; and an undaunted faith that there is *order* in the universe, an underlying harmony in Nature.*

For ages upon ages, man's knowledge of Nature and his interpretation of natural phenomena was exceedingly limited; his knowledge of the unwritten commandments or laws of Nature was practically nil. Even today, in the words of Sir Oliver Lodge, man has only scratched the surface of things. But the eyes of some men have been opened that they might see, and so show Nature to others. The list of the more prominent is not a very long one; neither is the list of the prophets. But science may be said to have had a beginning with Archimedes, who, in Michael Pupin's estimate (himself a worthy disciple) was the

* A. Vibert Douglas in his article "From Atoms to Stars" in the *Atlantic Monthly* for August, 1929, page 158.

"father of the scientific method of inquiry." This was something over two centuries B. C. For a period of approximately seventeen centuries science was dormant; then Galileo, towards the end of the sixteenth century, revived and utilized the Archimedean principles of inquiry, and "laid the foundation of the science of motion."

Prior to the renaissance of science, it must be noted that the religious world was being slowly disrupted, for Wyclif had done his work in the fourteenth century, and Huss early in the fifteenth century had made his vigorous protests against papal methods. Even Luther, Knox and Calvin had lived and died, and the Reformation was well on its way before science, represented by Galileo, opened its eyes in the sixteenth century. This is a point worthy of more elaborate comment than can here be given it.

References in preceding pages have been made to Nature and Nature's laws and commandments. In order to remove any possibility of misunderstanding, it is here stated that by "Nature" is to be understood, not a collection of self-evolved, blind, struggling, often antagonistic forces, "blundering experimentally" (as John Burroughs said), but the material, ultimate manifestation of Divine Love and Wisdom, of Creative Intelligence. It has been very clearly and beautifully said by the late Rev. Thomas A. King, in his "Story of the Bible" (pp. 49-52):

> God has placed before men two grand revelations. They are the volume of His works and the volume of His Word; and upon both He has impressed certain characteristics which are derived from His infinite mind. Both revelations unfold themselves progressively to the human mind, according to definite methods of action, which we term laws. The constant action of these laws in Nature, according to a fixed and universal system constitutes the order of the universe, and forms the basis of an intelligent knowledge and the construction of science. Not only is this true, but it is true that man's knowledge of the laws and facts of Nature has been attained very gradually. . . . Modern science has drawn aside the veil that ignorance of the constitution of the universe hung over men's eyes, and with the infallible key of knowledge has unlocked the doors and opened to the understanding the *inside* of the volume of

Nature, and thus admitted the human mind to an intelligent grasp of the facts, laws and eternal principles that lie back of Nature's phenomena. . . . *But the Bible came from the very Mind that produced Nature.* . . . The created world is the expression in created symbols, of the Creative Mind of God. The Bible is the expression in those symbols, written, of the same Mind. . . . When the scientific age came, the *inside* of *Nature* was opened. When the rational age of religion came, the *inside* of the *Bible* was opened. And just as the opening of the inside of Nature furnished a scientific explanation of Nature's outside phenomena, so the opening of the inside of the Bible furnished a rational explanation of its literal sense. . . . The inside of the Bible is in harmony with the inside of Nature; and the outside of the Bible is in harmony with the outside of Nature. It required *science* to open the inside of Nature, and it required *revelation* to open the inside of the Bible.

In the Psalms, there are two verses which may seem to the superficial reader to be diametrically opposed one to the other. For instance, we read in Psalms xxiv, 1, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein"; and in Psalms cxv, 16, "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's, but the earth hath he given to the children of men." As a matter of fact the earth with all its physical and chemical properties, all the laws and commandments under which it functions, has been given to man as a problem to be solved, and it is an imperative duty for man to acquaint himself with all the possibilities of the earth. This is one of the great purposes for which he was made. As it is said in Genesis i, 26 and 28:

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. . . . And God blessed them and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and *subdue it:* and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

This may be looked upon as Man's grand commission, as his authority to investigate and learn all within his com-

prehension of Nature's phenomena and laws,—the unwritten commandments.

With these thoughts in mind, it may be useful to glance at a very few, two or three only, of the problems of the earth with which every one is more or less intimately concerned; such as health, disease, nutrition, growth, old age, reproduction, sex, marriage, the home. These topics are much before humanity at the present time.

As to health and disease, it may be assumed that the one is normal, the other, abnormal. Health should be the possession of every living soul, because God created man in his own image, after his own likeness, and at the end of the long period of creation "God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good." It is therefore inconceivable that the most ancient people were sickly, unhealthy, diseased, as is the case with a large percentage of the human family today. The truly primitive man must have been well and strong, healthy and unacquainted with illness and suffering. It could not have been otherwise.

With such a wonderful start in life, why has Mankind so degenerated that he is the sickliest form of life on the earth? Why is it that Man is subject to a list of diseases requiring hundreds of pages to even briefly describe, and several volumes to describe in detail? Single volume modern text-books on medicine, such as Osler's and Cecil's, describe about five hundred diseases; and the entire medical field is very far from covered by these authoritative works.

With such a magnificent start as Man unquestionably had, we must today look upon disease—the abnormal, disorderly condition—not only as a misfortune, an unfortunate circumstance, but as a *real disgrace to humanity*, a something to be ashamed of, because disease is indicative of broken law, of disobedience to commandments, written and unwritten.

Harrowing and appalling statistics might be quoted to show the number of deaths in the United States and elsewhere annually from cancer, tuberculosis, beri-beri, dia-

betes, acute and chronic alcoholism, pernicious anemia, and other diseases; the number of hospital beds, not including nursing homes and private sanitaria, all of which are occupied continuously; the large number of mentally deficient children in the country, and the number of resident patients in hospitals for the insane and epileptic; and so on; but it is enough to call attention in this brief fashion to the fact that the majority of human beings die from disease many years before reaching the normal limit of life. Under the most favorable conditions, human longevity has reached only fifty-four years instead of being extended to the three score years and ten or four score years, claimed by the Psalmist to be the normal.

There is evidently something wrong with humanity even in this boasted and boastful practical and scientific age. Man has not yet acquired the understanding that will enable him to learn the commandments of the Lord, the unwritten commandments. He steadfastly overlooks the fact that the laws of chemistry act as unswervingly in the human body as they do in the chemical laboratory; chemical actions and reactions go on in the living body as they do outside the body. Mankind apparently does not appreciate the fact that the stomach and digestive organs have no special set of brains that will enable them to select the good and wholesome and discard the injurious. The digestive organs perform their functions in obedience to the definite biochemical laws that control chemical actions and reactions everywhere.

To specify some of the unwritten commandments disregarded by man, reference may be made to three instances in which man has deliberately violated, and today knowingly violates, decrees of Nature. With wide-open, if not with thoroughly comprehending, eyes man does something which is in direct opposition to the plain dictates of Nature.

Illustration number one has to do with rice. This is, as everyone knows, one of the grains, and a very popular food. It is said (Century Dictionary) to form "a larger part of

human food than the product of any one other plant, being often an almost exclusive diet in India, China, and the Malayan Islands, and abundantly used elsewhere," as in Korea, Japan, and the Philippines. Over seventy-five per cent of its substance consists of starchy matter; and on the outside of the grain is to be found a slightly brownish material composed of what are called proteins, mineral salts and vitamins. No need of further description. The point to be emphasized is this: man cannot, never has been able and never to the end of time will be able to make rice. Rice is a gift of the Almighty through Nature to Man. "And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth . . . to you it shall be for meat" (Gen. i, 29). But man, for an untold period, in his perversity has said, and still very plainly says, "This grain as given to me by the Creator is not what I like or want"; and so he washes and polishes off the outer, brownish, mineralized layer, and produces a clean, white, more attractive grain, which is so unbalanced from the standpoint of nutrition as to produce in many thousands of human beings a very fatal disease known as beri-beri, a disease from which many thousands die annually. Enough to call attention to the fact that man by his manipulations of this rich and useful and generous gift of the Creator's breaks an unwritten commandment, and brings a punishment upon himself in physical suffering and death.

Nature in obedience to definite laws, and for very definite purposes, produces an ideal food; and the production of this particular form of food is in itself a decree, a testimony, an ordinance, a commandment to the effect that man shall not divorce what the Infinite, through Nature, has joined together.

Unfortunately the great lesson of beri-beri has not yet been appreciated by mankind, and even the medical profession very evidently has not perceived the widely applicable principle underlying the recognized cause of beri-beri.

Illustration number two has to do with the well known

wheat, which in the Occident is what rice is in the Orient. At the present time it "furnishes the principal breadstuff among all civilized nations," after being converted into "flour." This white flour is exactly analogous to white rice in that it consists almost wholly of a very pure form of starch, which by itself is a very unbalanced and one-sided food; and in having had practically all the mineral salts, proteins, vitamins and bran removed from the whole grain in the milling process. Man cannot and never will be able to make a grain of wheat, but he can and does so thoroughly interfere with Nature's plans as to produce from this rich and nutritious food a substance which is fully as death-dealing as is the rice of the Orient. No single disease can be attributed to the use of white flour, as beri-beri can be attributed to the free use of rice, because the general diet among Western people is more varied than it is among the Eastern. But it can surely and easily be demonstrated by laboratory experimentation that mammals and birds can be made ill unto death by an exclusive diet of white flour products, while control animals on a whole-wheat grain diet will live indefinitely in a healthy condition. Details of experimental evidence are not suitable in this connection, but can be found in accessible records. As in the days of the early Christian Church (to paraphrase reverently I Corinthians iii, 6 and 7), "Man may plant and man may water, but it is God alone that giveth the increase."

In the case of wheat, man presumptuously attempts to improve one of the Creator's wondrous gifts; with, as usual, under such circumstances, dire results. Certainly, if an All-Wise Intelligence has put together a well-balanced and sufficient combination of chemical elements for Man's sustenance, it is equivalent to a command that the natural combination should not be interfered with; a command not written on tables of stone, but unwritten in the book of Nature.

Nature tells us, if we have receptive ears, that all things are related as cause and effect; that everything in the uni-

verse is made for a use; that things are created in accordance with law and order for a specific purpose; that man should coöperate with and not disobey natural laws.

In no one thing does Man show his presumption, perversity, audacity, ignorance and thoughtlessness more plainly than in example number three, which has to do with milk. In this unique mammalian secretion we find one of Nature's amazing previsions and provisions. Nature knows beforehand that each species of mammals will need for the specific purpose of its growth and early development a special kind of food, and that food is provided under natural conditions for the very definite length of time it is needed; in accordance with precise and exact laws.

Nature says that the milk furnished by each species is the perfect food for the young of that species for a definite length of time; and Nature says no more milk shall be secreted after that time; therefore, no more milk is to be used as food; also, that the young animal has reached a stage of growth wherein the adult diet is the sufficient diet to be used.

This is a commandment or law of Nature.

Man is the only animal of 3280 species of mammals that intentionally and habitually uses milk after the period of weaning.

Nature says that each of the 3280 recognized species of mammals shall secrete its own particular quality of milk. Man is the only animal that intentionally and habitually uses, at any time, the milk of another, and that a very inferior, species. It is reasonable to assume that the needs of a mouse, the guinea pig, the fox, the lamb, the bovine calf, the hippopotamus or the elephant calf and the human infant are different. These needs are known by Nature better than they are known by Man.

Nature also says that this food, milk, shall pass from the maternal organism to the offspring without exposure to air, so as to be free from infection. Bovine milk, as obtained by man, has been exposed to air and becomes germ

laden before it reaches the consumer. These germs live on the milk, grow and reproduce at the expense of the milk. Into the milk is thrown all the excreta of these germs. The average number of germs per cubic centimeter, during the month of September, 1929, in the milk of seventy-eight producers and distributors in the city of Boston, reached the exceptionally low figure of 15,145. In order to destroy disease-carrying germs and spores, the milk is necessarily pasteurized. No one knows what additional damage is done the milk by this procedure.

It is claimed (as per U. S. Census) that twenty-seven per cent of the money spent for food in the United States is spent for milk and its products.

In 1917 the per capita consumption of milk and its products (cream, butter, cheese) in the United States was 834 pounds. In 1923 it had risen to 1020 pounds.

School children are advised by School Boards, School Physicians, and Milk Producers Associations to drink at least three pints of milk a day; approximately one half of the needed food.

If such an enormous consumption of this much manipulated, unnatural food-stuff is in violation of Nature's commandments, why should there not be a penalty exacted? And what is that penalty? No one can tell with accuracy just what ill results are due to this traditional custom; but that does not mean there are no evil results. Possibly and probably many of the common physical and mental deficiencies and unbalanced functions some day will be traced to this custom. There is yet much to be learned concerning Nature's plans and methods and commands.

As the noted scientist, Robert A. Millikan, so aptly says:

> We can still look with a sense of wonder and mystery and *reverence* upon the fundamental elements of the physical world as they have been partially revealed to us in this century. . . . It is true that we are slowly learning more of *the rules in nature's game*, so that our progress is not made by hit or miss experimenting, nor by random theorizing, but by following a more or less systematic, if not always a strictly logical, procedure. . . . The dis-

coveries of our generation have taught us a wholesome lesson of *humility, wonder* and *joy* in the face of an as yet incomprehensible physical universe. . . . We have learned to work with *new satisfaction, new hope* and *new enthusiasm*, because there is still *so much* that we do not understand, and because . . . we have found in our lifetimes more new relations in physics than had come to light in all preceding ages put together, and because the stream of discovery as yet shows no signs of abatement.

And a poet (Dr. Gordon's Presidential Address before the American Institute of Homoeopathy) has beautifully echoed the sentiments of the scientists in saying

> And Nature, the old nurse, took
> The child upon her knee
> Saying "Here is a story book
> Thy Father has written for thee."
>
> "Come, wander with me," she cried
> "Into regions yet untrod
> And read what is still unread
> In the manuscripts of God."

Is it not desirable that we should unite humbly and with all our hearts with the Psalmist in his prayer, "Thy hands have made me and fashioned me; give me understanding that I may learn thy commandments."

And the Revelator has said, in the concluding chapter of the Book of Books,

"Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

John P. Sutherland, M.D., Sc.D.

RELIGION VERSUS HUMANISM*

By the Rev. Lewis Field Hite, A.M.

THOUGHTFUL men of the present day are deeply aroused by the mental and moral confusion of our age. The radical re-actionary impulses, attitudes, and propaganda which stir and move young and old are threatening our Christian civilization with bitter struggle and disastrous overthrow. The extent to which the Christian religion and Christian morals have been repudiated and cast aside is little appreciated by those who have carelessly and without question moved along with the current, and who have been entertained by the prophecies and promises of a new day. It is not merely that some errors of the past have been recognized and renounced, but the underlying principles and presuppositions of Christian thought and conduct have been abandoned, as unworthy and outworn. For these there have been substituted the principles and presuppositions of a naturalistic and individualistic philosophy. Parts of the Christian vocabulary have been preserved, but with new and strange meanings. The idea of God and the idea of the supernatural have been deliberately relegated as fictions of the imagination to the realm of superstition and mythology. The only world that is accepted as real is the world of nature,—the external universe and man. Life is the body of re-actions between man and the external universe. Man is a more or less important part of nature, and has his origin within and from nature. He is connected genetically as a term in the animal series with the lower forms of life, and through this connection his capacities and faculties are derived. He is endowed with emotions, feelings, impulses, affection, imagination,

* *A Preface to Morals.* By Walter Lippmann. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1929. 348 pp., 8vo. Price $2.50.

thought, and purposeful activity. In the exercise of these endowments, he passes from stage to stage of progressive life, and may reach the stage of rational and personal maturity. This is the program of humanism,—humanism in the metaphysical, ethical, and religious sense, not in the ordinary literary and historical sense, although the latter grows out of the former.

There was a period of dissolution in the eighteenth century, brought on by the invasion of naturalism and rationalism. We seem to be now in the culmination of that period. A similar period, perhaps not so refined by rational perversions, followed the conquests of Alexander the Great, when Greek thought, and to a limited extent Greek administration, dominated all the nations of the Mediterranean basin. Long standing habits and customs were broken up, ethical and religious standards were uprooted and thrown into confusion, political and civil life were either left without guidance or subjected to foreign control, the philosophies of the day were as conflicting and confusing as were the practices of daily life. The effort to attain the wisdom of life ended in dismal failure. The attempt to conceive the ideal wise man brought confusion. This was the condition of the world when the Lord came in the flesh, and lived the life which met the demand for the ideal wise man. In this way human life was furnished with an example and a standard, and men could order their lives in accordance with a definite body of religious principles, which brought them into right relations to the Source and Lord of all life. But self-seeking and worldliness made progress difficult and vacillating. The naturalistic and "Romantic" forces of the Renaissance, the disruptive tendencies of the Protestant Reformation, and the materialism of the new development of the physical sciences, combined to upset and disintegrate the religious and moral settlement achieved by the work of the great Scholastics. Hume, Kant, Rousseau, Voltaire, and Condillac laid the foundations for systematic doubt of God's existence, for systematic materialism, for

systematic and destructive criticism of religion and morals, and for the systematic assertion of naturalism and individualism. Spinoza had already applied the natural history method to the study of the Bible, with the result that the Bible was reduced to the level of mere race history, in which we may, if we are sufficiently interested, discover and select certain general principles of good conduct. In short, by the middle of the eighteenth century, rationalism had uprooted the settled religious and moral convictions of a large and important part of the Christian world. As a consequence, masses of people were left without sure reliance upon Divine guidance, and the language of traditional Christianity became little more than a body of empty symbols. The religion of the day was vitiated by the love of worldly dominion on the one hand and by a perverted and artificial faith on the other. To meet and remedy these diseased conditions, the Lord, according to predictions, came again to men on the higher level of the spirit; and by the body of doctrine revealed through the enlightenment of Swedenborg He lifts the minds of men into the spiritual light of the Bible. In this way a knowledge and acknowledgment of the Lord may be restored to those who will make use of the means provided. This is what we know as the Second Coming of the Lord in the spiritual sense of His Word. Those who accept this body of doctrine, and order their lives by it, are led to the spiritual light and spiritual life which the Lord now gives; and of these He constitutes His New Church upon earth, the New Jerusalem. Thus a new age is ushered in, and a remedy is provided for the spiritual and moral diseases of humanity.

Many earnest and thoughtful people appreciate the wide departure of modern naturalism from the Christian religion, but are embarrassed by the language and the presuppositions of orthodoxy. Too often the result is confusion and compromise. The great need of the time is a clarification of the issues, so that people may take their stand deliberately and intelligently. We need to become more fully aware of

the re-actionary temper of the day, involving an indiscriminating rejection of traditional Christian dogma. It is not merely that certain obviously irrational Christian dogmas are cast aside, but more seriously and vitally that the presuppositions of the whole body of Christian thought are rejected. In the place of these pre-suppositions are substituted the pre-suppositions of a radical naturalistic and individualistic philosophy. For the Christian doctrines of sin and salvation are substituted the doctrines that man is naturally good and needs only to develop his native capacities. It is assumed that if men will only cultivate and direct their natural impulses, they will progress to the full attainment of human excellence. In short Humanism is substituted for religion.

This situation is clearly recognized and ably discussed by Walter Lippmann in his "A Preface to Morals." The book is one of extraordinary interest and importance. It is the work of a well informed and well trained mind. The author is in full sympathy with the re-actionary currents of the day, and is convinced that the rejection of the Christian religion by the re-actionaries is final; he shares their confidence that human nature is completely sufficient to deal with its own development and destiny, to work out its own salvation. It is this conviction that gives form to the book and determines the arrangement of the materials.

The first part, under the head of "The Dissolution of the Ancestral Order," deals with the fact, the grounds, and the consequences of unbelief. The treatment is candid, penetrating, and instructive; well thought out and well expressed. The second part, under the head of "The Foundations of Humanism," is a well executed constructive effort, based on the assumption that man is sufficient unto himself to accomplish his complete development. A third part is added to illustrate the application of Humanism to modern business, government, and sexual relations. Here as elsewhere there is much clear and sound criticism, and a constructive effort which is helpful as far as it goes.

Perhaps the author's purpose is best expressed in his own words:

> Among those who no longer believe in the religion of their fathers, some are defiantly proud, and many are indifferent. But there are also a few, perhaps an increasing number, who feel that there is a vacancy in their lives. This inquiry deals with their problem. It is not intended to disturb the serenity of those who are unshaken in the faith they hold, and it is not concerned with those who are still exhilarated by their escape from some stale orthodoxy. It is concerned with those who are perplexed by the consequences of their own irreligion. It deals with the problem of unbelief, not as believers are accustomed to deal with it, in a spirit of men confidently calling the lost sheep back into the fold, but as unbelievers themselves must, I think, face the problem if they face it candidly and without presumption.
>
> When such men put their feelings into words they are likely to say that, having lost their faith, they have lost the certainty that their lives are significant, and that it matters what they do with their lives. If they deal with young people they are likely to say that they know of no compelling reason which certifies the moral code they adhere to, and that, therefore, their own preferences, when tested by the ruthless curiosity of their children, seem to have no sure foundation of any kind. They are likely to point to the world about them, and to ask whether the modern man possesses any criterion by which he can measure the value of his own desires, whether there is any standard he really believes in which permits him to put a term upon that pursuit of money, of power, and of excitement which has created so much of the turmoil and the squalor and the explosiveness of modern civilization. (Pp. 2-3.)

This defines with precision the class to which the book is addressed,—the class of unbelievers who, having rejected any and all religion, find themselves facing the consequences of their unbelief in their inability to make life worth while. Having cast aside religion and the moral code, they commit themselves to the pursuit of satisfactions, and then realize that the mere "pursuit of happiness was always a most unhappy quest." This class, however, when more fully explored, is found to possess the characteristics of the "modern man" and of "modern civilization"; the class expands with thoughtful observation, and we are face to face with a general symptom of the age.

This theme is developed through various phases and applications under the topics, "The Problem of Unbelief," "God in the Modern World," "The Loss of Certainty," "The Acids of Modernity," "The Breakdown of Authority," "Lost Provinces," "The Drama of Destiny." "The Dissolution of the Ancestral Order" is brought about by the dissolution of "faith and morals." The whole situation may be summed up as the destruction of faith in God, the breadown of authority, and the loss of certainty. Reaction against the requirements of religion and traditional morality is accompanied by a heightened feeling of self-sufficiency and self-confidence which overflows in a fancied wealth of prophesies of future developments. But these prophesies have turned out to be illusive and vain. After throwing off "conventions, tabus, gods, priests, princes, fathers, revelations," each with "no master save his mood," they fall victims to contrary moods, "and do not know what they wish to do." Their fancied freedom is a contrast effect; freedom to reject is taken to mean freedom to believe and to act without compulsion or restraint of any kind. The modern man has ceased to believe; but the need to believe remains. There is no interpretation of events which he is compelled to accept, but he must accept the events. There is no authority, religious or moral, to which he must turn, "but there is coercion in opinions, fashions, and fads." One kind of authority is rejected; another accepted without question, or grasped at in desperation.

This analysis and description may not be ascribed to the cold critic; it is that of one who shares the unbelief and the re-actionary tendencies and efforts of the "modern man." It is therefore authoritative and intimate. It might be said that history is here repeating itself, that there have been other ages of re-action and unbelief. The Age of Pericles might be cited, when "every thing was in dispute"; the Age of the Renaissance and the Reformation was another. In such cases, we may assume that a period of dissolution will be followed by one of conformity, that the heterodoxy of

one age will become the orthodoxy of the next. But "the position of modern men who have broken with the religion of their fathers is in certain profound ways different from that of other men in other ages." Conditions are such as "to render any fixed and authoritative belief incredible to large masses of men." "The irreligion of the modern world is radical to a degree for which there is . . . no counterpart." The dissolution of the present age is deep; the feeling of certainty itself is dissolving, "it is dissolving not merely for an educated minority, but for every one who comes within the orbit of modernity."

> The acids of modernity are so powerful that they do not tolerate a crystallization of ideas which will serve as a new orthodoxy into which man can retreat. And so the modern world is haunted by a realization, which it becomes constantly less easy to ignore, that it is impossible to reconstruct an enduring orthodoxy, and impossible to live well without the satisfactions which an orthodoxy would provide. (Pp. 19-20.)

It is clear from the above analysis of modern religious thought that there has been, in Protestant communities at least, a definite and final abandonment of the Christian religion, together with the deliberate assertion that no settled religious reconstruction is any longer possible. The author goes on to develop the particulars, the full meaning, and the consequences of this abandonment. He proceeds to show that the fundamental presuppositions of the Christian religion have been abandoned, and not merely some of the dogmatic accretions.

First of all, he discusses the meaning of God in the modern world. The central difficulty here is "the modern man's inability to convince himself that the constitution of the universe includes facts which in our skeptical jargon we call supernatural." This is another way of saying that for the modern man there is no possibility of God's existence in the universe as we know it. It is then the nature of the universe itself that excludes the existence of God. In view of this fact and difficulty there is a distinction made between the popular idea of God and that held by the select few·

who have cast aside the anthropomorphic God, and yet retain the word God as a symbol for "the sum of all ideal values," or of "the ground for concrete reality." As the author pertinently remarks, "For the purposes of religion he is no God at all." This double meaning of the word "God" may enable those of opposite camps to talk together in apparent unanimity, but it is misleading and is of questionable honesty. Religion rests on a basis of fact, or what is believed to be fact. If the fact is questioned or discredited, religion ceases. If God is held to be merely a logical or æsthetic convenience, He becomes a purely subjective creation of man's fancied needs. Without God there can be no revelation, and therefore no Bible which is the revealed Word of God.

The place of the Bible in the modern world is of the first importance in the attempt to explain the loss of religious certainty. Throughout a large part of Christian history the Bible was adapted to educated minds by the use of allegory. Origen, St. Augustine, Wyclif, and the rest, made the letter of the Bible acceptable and significant by allegorizing it to remove difficulties. But with the Protestant Reformation allegory was abandoned. Luther and Calvin denounced it as mischievous and confusing. So the principle of literal interpretation was adopted. But this principle led to the systematic attempt to find out "what the Bible did mean literally to those who wrote"; in other words, it led to the systematic attempt to apply the natural history method to explain the contents and character of the Bible, or to what we now call the "Higher Criticism." A modern device, a modification of the allegorical, takes the literal statements of the Bible as symbols of experiences which are thought to be common and abiding. This amounts to picking and choosing the statements that lend themselves to this treatment, and casting aside the rest. "The Bible thus becomes no more than a revered collection of hypotheses which each man may reject or accept in the light of his own knowledge." Revelation is rejected;

the Bible is robbed of its authority; religion has disappeared. "Something quite fundamental is left out of modernist creeds. . . . That something is the most abiding of all the experiences of religion; namely, the conviction that religion comes from God" (p. 47). It is this that gives authority, certainty, and sanction. This explains why people do not go to Church. The reason is "that they are not so certain that they are going to meet God when they go to Church. If they had that certainty they would go." They would go not "to hear the preacher or listen to the music"; they would go to "worship God."

What is the cause of this loss of belief in God and in religion? The author seems to stand apart from the situation; and certainly he does succeed surprisingly well in treating it objectively. But he is really an important constituent element in the condition described; he shares the unbelief, and justifies the grounds of it. His thesis is, that modern conditions make it natural and inevitable that people should find themselves incapable of believing in any settled creed, or of faith in God. He seems to concede that the experience of God is more convincing than any definition of God, and he cites St. Chrysostom as a shining example of those who believe because they do not comprehend; they believe on the basis of the experience of God, not because they understand God. But in these cases there is more knowledge of God than is recognized; their belief is in the kind of God they think of. But with "modern men" this faith is not a guarantee of the reality of the object of the faith; moreover, they have a passion for disbelieving what they do not understand. The fundamental difficulty with modern men is that their ordinary experience seems to contradict the very existence of God as Creator and Ruler of the universe. The chaotic and unstable conditions of modern life, especially in the cities, have moulded a state of mind and a habit of life devoid of settled principles of objective and authoritative force. The only settled principle and conviction is, that each and every man should do

as he pleases. For this state of mind there is no such thing as truth, and consequently no such thing as God: such a man "has for inner guidance only a conscience which consists, as he half suspects, of the confused echoes of earlier tunes."

As a consequence of the disbelief in God and in the supernatural, all authority of supernatural government has been swept away. "There has gone out of modern life a working conviction that we are living under the dominion of one supreme ideal, the attainment of eternal happiness by obedience to God's will on earth." In the middle ages it was easy and natural for men to believe in the Divine government of the Universe. The Pope as God's representative on earth was Divinely commissioned to govern the world, and therefore his government was supreme in Church and state. "It is this concrete sense of Divine government which modern men have lost." When Luther defied the Pope and the Church, and denied to it the exclusive privilege of administering God's government (the Reformation followed him in this), the obvious basis for belief in Divine government disappeared, and with it the Divine authority of the Church; for "the disposition to believe in the rule of God depended . . . upon the capacity to believe in a visible church upon earth which holds its commission from God." So the ultimate source of authority was removed, and the general breakdown of authority followed. With the spread and multiplication of Protestant Churches, it became increasingly difficult to combine the principle of authority with freedom of private interpretation and direct personal access to God. Under these conditions no one Church could claim more than limited authority; and a certain measure of practical toleration became expedient. No Church could pretend to exclusive Divine authority; and yet each Church must claim and exercise authority over its own members. The situation becomes more complicated in the relation of Church and state; each Church member owes allegiance to both. As a practical compromise, each citizen

must treat all Churches alike. This involves that loyalty to the state and the authority of the state must prevail. The situation becomes peculiarly complicated in the case of education, and especially in the case of the public schools. No Church can surrender the obligation to teach its children its distinctive doctrines. But in the public schools the teaching must be non-sectarian. In effect the teaching is agnostic, or else there is a Catholic or Protestant slant. The result is that the children are weaned from their religion, and given over to patriotism. In this way loyalty passes from Church to state. It is curious that the doctrine of the Divine right of kings grew out of the clash between Church and state. When Pope Paul V excommunicated the Doge and the Senate of Venice for arresting an immoral canon, the Venetian government replied that it was founded on Divine Right. The Pope gave way, and the reign of the Pope as King of Kings was ended. It is curious again that the loss of its civil power led the Roman Church to declare the doctrine of infallibility; it was the assertion of the supreme right to teach religious truth. In short, the government of human affairs has been divorced from Divine government; "religious obedience is no longer the central loyalty from which all other obligations are derived." And so it is that religion no longer regulates the lives of men; the authority of the state has become supreme. The right of revolution is asserted, but even in this assertion, men "are forced to acknowledge that loyalty in the modern world is complex, that it has become divided and uncertain, and that the age of faith which was absolute is gone for them."

The progressive dissolution of religion in the mind of our day has had a disastrous effect in removing the ordinary conduct of life from religious influence and control. This is illustrated in the case of business, the family, and art. There has been an age-long antagonism between religion and business. The Church recognized and emphasized this in accordance with the principle, "Ye cannot serve God and

Mammon." Religious agencies may and do appeal to business; but "there is no longer any body of doctrine in the churches which enables them to speak with authority."

> The emancipation of business from religious control is perhaps even more threatening to the authority of the churches than the rivalry of sects or the rise of civil power. . . . Business is a daily occupation. . . . That the waking interest of most people should be carried on wholly separated from the faith they possess means that the churches have lost one of the great provinces of the human soul. (P. 88.)

The dissolution of religious authority has proceeded to family relations. Marriage and the education of children have passed for the most part from the Church to the state, or to the whims and convenience of individuals.

So too in the case of art. In the middle ages, artists had the great themes of religious tradition which inspired them and kept them in touch with the deep currents of human life. The great cathedrals and paintings belong to this period. But the waning of religious interest following upon the iconoclasm of the Renaissance and the Reformation deprived artists of this background and support. Artists had to look elsewhere for themes and inspiration. In the absence of inspiring themes they had recourse to the philosophy of "art for art's sake," and labored under the double burden of invention and execution. Left without guidance or significance, art entered the realm of chaos.

The Christian epic from the Garden of Eden to the New Jerusalem gave unity and significance to human history. Science has displaced this epic with an impersonal and shifting body of abstractions, in which human interests and destiny are ignored. This is the real ground of the deep conflict between religion and science. The attempted reconciliation is an impossible one. Science does not "provide an account of the world in which human destiny is the central theme. Therefore, science, though it has displaced revelation, is not a substitute for it." "It does not pretend to justify the ways of God to man."

When men believed in God, the moral problem for each

man was "to make his will conform to the will of God." The distinction between good and evil was revealed in the commandments of God. But the radical changes of modern life dissolved the premises of this morality. The crisis was reached during the eighteenth century in the teachings of Immanuel Kant. He argued that God's existence could not be proved, and then proceeded to argue that He must exist to justify morality. "But the whole temper of the modern intellect is to deny that what ought to be true necessarily is true." In view of the loss of belief in God, the modern man must find some other ground of morality. He must find "the tests of righteousness wholly within human experience."

> The difference between good and evil must be a difference which men themselves recognize and understand. . . .
>
> It follows, too, that virtue cannot be commanded; it must be willed out of personal conviction and desire. . . .
>
> Such a morality may be properly called humanism, for it is centered not in superhuman but in human nature.

Here at last we reach the positive thesis of the book. Up to this point we have followed closely the text of the analysis and description of modern unbelief. We have followed it at such length because of the penetrating insight and the extraordinary vividness of the account, as well as because of the importance of the subject. We have now passed in review *the preface of morals*,—a suitable description of the dissolution of the traditional moral code. We recognize that the description is eminently fair and illuminating; it is a brilliant piece of work. We are not sure that all the aspects of the modern man have been fairly considered, but certainly the re-actionary and irreligious temper of the age has been set forth with rare sympathy and light. But we must say that the author's representation of the modern idea of God is narrow and too meager; it fails to do justice to the best Christian preaching, literature, and poetry. The God of the best modern thought is more than a King. He is Creator, Heavenly Father, the Source of Love and Wisdom, and Power; the Source of

religious experience throughout the ages. No doubt the author would be the first to admit this, and would plead special purpose and special field. We on the other hand are eager to acknowledge that within his chosen field he has done an admirable and helpful work. All through this *preface,* it has been a nice question when and how far the author expresses personal conviction; like a consummate actor he inspires conviction, but may or may not feel it. But from this point on, personal conviction is evident and pervasive. The author is stating his own position earnestly and positively. It is this position that we are now to set forth and to examine critically.

The author is perfectly clear and positive that he is offering a substitute for the Christian religion. He is fully convinced that the Christian religion—in fact, all religion that depends upon God—has been deliberately and finally set aside as irrational and as unsuited to the age. He is offering a philosophy of life which he thinks is based upon a more extensive and a more accurate knowledge of the universe, and especially upon a more intimate knowledge of human nature. He has come to the conclusion that there is no place in the universe for God or the supernatural, and therefore he proposes to build upon nature, especially upon human nature. And so he proceeds to lay the "Foundations of Humanism." His fundamental thesis is that, if our desires were uniformly fulfilled, there would be no need of either religion or morality.

> In a world where no man desired what he could not have, there would be no need to regulate human conduct and therefore no need for morality. In a world where each man could have what he desired, there would be no need for consolation and for reassuring guarantees that justice, mercy and love will ultimately prevail. In a world where there was perfect adjustment between human desires and their environment, there would be no problem of evil: we would not know the meaning of sin, sorrow, crime, fear, frustration, pain, and emptiness. (P. 145.)

But "we do not live in such a well-ordered world." Men have tried to make one, in thought at least, by adopting one

of two alternatives: either they put a stop to desire, which is Buddhism; or they depend upon Divine Providence to fulfil their desires, which is "the heaven of all popular religions." It is by prayer that men seek in the last resort the fulfilment of their desires. Prayer is a very complicated experience, varying with individuals and ages; but it always implies that the world is not what it ought to be. We have the feeling that we ought not to be defeated; the tradition of the Golden Age has haunted men from the beginning. Through desire we transform the memory of the Golden Age into "the anticipation of utopia to come." In other words, the world was once what we feel it ought to be.

There are two approaches to life, to "the land of heart's desire" where "no man desires what he cannot have, and each man can have what he desires": the one is to subdue his native impulses, transform his will; the other is that, man being naturally innocent and good, the only thing needed is to provide opportunities for the fulfilment of his desires. This latter theory of human nature, which dominates contemporary thought, challenges "all the greatest teachers of wisdom." So then the answer to the question, What is the wisdom of life? depends upon what we conceive to be the nature of man. The two contrasting and opposing views of human nature seem to have proceeded rhythmically throughout history. When human nature is distrusted and repressed as innately evil, it rebounds and asserts itself; when it is trusted as inherently good, it works itself out in so much disorder and corruption that "men once again idealize order and restraint." This has led to Puritanism; but it is the teaching of the sages, "Socrates, Buddha, Plotinus, and Spinoza, that good life is impossible without asceticism, the practice of self-discipline." "That conception of good life has become so repulsive to the present generation that it is almost incapable of understanding and appreciating the original insight" of "all the great religions" and "all the great moral philosophies." While this may not be convincing, it creates a presumption

which cannot be ignored. Science has enormously increased our competence in physics and history; but for an understanding of human nature we are largely dependent, as were the sages, on introspection, general observation, and intuition. "There has been no revolutionary advance here since the hellenic philosophers." Aristotle's "Ethics" is as fresh as is, for example, Bertrand Russell. "It is, then, as an insight into human nature" that we need to consider the bearing of ascetic discipline and renunciation upon good life. The modern world assumes as a matter of course that "human passions, if thoroughly liberated from all tyrannies and distortions, would by their fulfilment achieve happiness." Thus the prevailing philosophy is at odds on the most fundamental of all issues with the wisdom of the past. Plato described a system of education which by stern discipline, would enable men to "find their happiness in an appreciation of a perfectly ordered commonwealth." This is the principle of asceticism. Rabelais is perhaps the best representative among moderns of the natural man. He pictured a society in which there was but one rule, "*Do What Thou Wilt.*" "But there was a catch in this rule," as there is in "any doctrine of the natural goodness of man." For example, Rabelais excluded the vicious, and admitted only the virtuous. So that his society was ruled by the sentiment of honor. We are advised by those who assault Christian tradition to "live by instinct *and* intelligence." This means that intelligence must be "in some respects the master as well as the servant of instinct." This oscillation between trust and distrust is disastrous to a stable humanism; "if it is to have any power to make life coherent and orderly, it must hold an assured view of how man can govern himself." He oscillates because he cannot obey every impulse, for he has conflicting impulses; they all cannot be satisfied. "Desires are, for all practical purposes, unlimited and insatiable, and therefore any ethics which does not recognize the necessity of putting restraint upon naïve desire is inherently absurd." On the other hand, "the attempt to

measure the degree in which impulse is to be permitted to express itself is obviously full of difficulties." This is the difficulty which Aristotle's "Ethics" meant to solve; and he solved it by his doctrine of the mean, the mean between excess and defect; for example, the mean between rashness and cowardice is courage. Courage is a virtue, the extremes are vices. The difficulty about this doctrine is to find the mean. A moral code like this requires an inventory of good and bad desires and fulfilments. This implies that good and bad are objective qualities, that some desires are inherently good, others inherently bad; and so of objects of desire. This is what is known as "the pathetic fallacy." For each desire or each object taken separately without relation to anything else has no moral quality either good or bad. Objects are good and evil only in relation to man's will and purposes. In other words, good and evil are moral constructions. "Therefore the quality of good and evil lies not in the impulses as such, nor in the objects as such, but in the relationship between impulses and objects." "If our impulses did not impinge upon each other and upon objects, there would be no problem of good and evil." "Therefore the making of inventories of good and bad is fundamentally misleading." Another fallacy is that of making lists of our impulses, in the belief that we are analyzing human character. The same impulse moves different persons in different ways; then too impulses are exceedingly complex, and so are objects. "We do not know enough about them to pass judgment." Moreover, our desires change from the cradle to the grave, and so the desirability of objects; we, in a measure, create the desirability. "It is impossible, then, to make lists of good and evil desires, and good and evil objects." The attempt to construct moral codes on the basis of an inventory is to attempt to understand human nature, which is ever developing, by taking snapshots at momentary cross-sections of it. To understand human nature, for the purposes of moralizing, we must learn to look upon each moment of behavior not as the manifestation of certain

fixed elements, but as a stage in the process of development.

The above sketch, largely in the author's own language, gives the basis upon which he proceeds to construct his theory of human nature and of human development, and to define the nature of good life. The fundamental principles of moral codes are analyzed and set forth with extraordinary clearness and judicious criticism. For moral codes he substitutes the history of man's development from childhood to maturity, and makes maturity the proper end of man's effort and development. This transition from infancy to maturity he calls "The Matrix of Humanism." In pursuing this history, he makes use of insight and "the best available psychological science," together with the deepest wisdom of the greatest teachers. But after all, our knowledge of human nature is inadequate, and therefore he resorts to "imaginative construction." The passage from childhood to maturity is conceived according to the scheme of Dr. S. Ferenczi. The child lives at first in a world where everything seems to combine to satisfy his will and desires. Later he finds the world more and more resistant; he meets opposition, difficulty, and defeat in his efforts to satisfy his desires. He must adapt himself to the world rather than expect the world to adapt itself to him. The more he understands the world, the more indifferent it becomes to his desires and demands. In passing to maturity, he learns by degrees that he must regulate his desires, and must adapt them to a world which is indifferent to his wishes; until he feels the vast indifference of the universe to his own fate, he has not learned to "look maturely upon the heavens." This process of putting off childishness and putting on maturity is real education; it is the natural growth of wisdom. Asceticisms and moralities are means to this end. The hope, desire, and effort to attain maturity is "a high religion"; the function of "high religion" is to reveal to men the equality of mature experience. "High religion is a prophesy and an anticipation of what life is like when desire is in perfect harmony with reality."

It is obvious that this conception of human nature and this understanding of man's development and perfection is just the opposite of the religious view, the view that "religion comes from God." The author accepts this contrast and opposition, but he chooses to define religion in terms of "theocracy," and restricts the meaning of God, for popular religion, to that of a heavenly King. This enables him to contrast belief in a supernatural government with "the religion of the wise," religion as "the art and theory of the internal life of man in so far as it depends on the man himself, and on what is permanent in the nature of things." The point of this is that the religion of modern men, "the only possible religion for all modern men," is the religion of internal discipline, self-imposed and self-directed, a religion that does away with God deliberately and finally. By the high religion the author means what he thinks was the real teaching of the greatest masters of wisdom, the attainment of maturity of character. The acids of modernity having dissolved the adjustments of the ancestral order, "there no longer exists a moral code which the moralist can interpret, administer, and enforce. The effect of that is moral anarchy within and without." The moralist must revise his premises; he must occupy himself with the problem of how to promote growth to maturity. The guiding principle to the attainment of maturity is the quality of "disinterestedness"; it is that quality which comes into play when we objectify and rise superior to our impulses and desires. It is the quality of disinterestedness that enables us to pass judgment upon our natural desires, to condemn or to approve them. The principle of disinterestedness "will, if pursued resolutely, untangle the moral confusion of the age, and make plain, what is not now plain," the meaning of life. It is to be shown that this ideal of human life is really suitable and necessary in modern civilization, and that it is actually compulsory.

[If our educators are to direct this progress to maturity successfully] they will have to see quite clearly how and in what sense

the ideal of disinterestedness is inherent and inevitable in the modern world. The remaining chapters of this book are an attempt to do that by demonstrating that in the three great phases of human interest, in business, in government, and in sexual relations, the ideal is now implicit and necessary. (P. 231.)

The newness of modern life depends upon the unparalleled development of science and machinery. In the case of science, the ideal of disinterestedness operates in the elimination of "the personal equation." The scientist as far as possible puts aside deliberately and systematically all personal interest in observation and interpretation of facts: he tries to direct his investigation on the principle of truth for truth's sake. Modern business because of the application of science is largely technological. The use of machinery and the organization and management of business require detachment and disinterestedness. The operator and business manager must eliminate as far as possible his likes and dislikes, "and submit his desires to the discipline of objective information." Machine technology has forced upon our civilization ideals of industry which are necessary to industry itself, the ideals of disinterestedness and maturity.

Modern society is exceedingly complex. The interests of social, business, and political life are multitudinous. Loyalties are many and diverse. These conditions require and promote a certain amount of toleration, neutrality, and disinterestedness with respect to men and interests. Government is likewise more complex than in the past. In absolute monarchies, the will of the king is the law of the land, and government is simple because it is organized to carry out the king's will. In limited monarchies, the government is complex, and is administered in accordance with institutions and laws which are independent of the king's will. But in democracies, whether constitutional or otherwise, the government is organized and administered by the will of the people themselves. This means that politicians who direct or follow public opinion are swayed by a multiplicity of interests, and must be more or less subservient to them all,

and more or less impartial. The statesman, who rises superior to special interests, and is able to survey them all from the point of view of the community as a whole, must acquire and maintain an attitude of disinterestedness and maturity. Thus the principle of disinterestedness and maturity is necessary and inherent in modern governments of advanced types.

Modern conditions of life have involved marriage in extraordinary difficulties. Radicalism, individualism, and naturalistic philosophies have suggested ways of avoiding the inherent and necessary obligations of marriage; they have followed the logic of their own expedients rather than the logic of human nature. These expedients rest upon narrow views and false analyses of the nature of love. Human nature is deeply involved in marriage and this means that men and women must fulfil the obligations of marriage in order to attain fulness of life and maturity of character. They must acquire the disinterestedness which maturity implies, and they must employ the discipline necessary in passing from childhood to full manhood.

This rapid survey of the contents and the argument of the book leaves us with the assurance that Mr. Lippmann has performed a great task with extraordinary success. He has exposed with abundant clarity and consistency the reactionary temper and convictions of modern irreligion. Whether his description fits the modern temper as a whole is a question of vital importance to the student of our times. However this may be, Mr. Lippmann has offered an interpretation of modern life which must be taken into account most seriously by teachers of religion and morality. Those who differ must show that the fundamental thesis is in error, and that the theory built upon it is insufficient to furnish the light needed for the conduct of life. The thesis is that man is sufficient unto himself, and needs no outside guidance or support. All that he needs is to exercise his own faculties to get an understanding of himself and the world that surrounds him. With this understanding he

may and will proceed to live the best life he is capable of. His own experience gradually enlightened will give an adequate knowledge of two guiding principles, disinterestedness and maturity. With these two self-evolved principles and ideals the discipline and guidance of life will be assured. This is the Socratic principle that virtue is knowledge, and it labors under the same difficulty,—the difficulty of acquiring and attaining the knowledge required to make the principle true. Socrates proceeded by way of definition; Plato had to fall back on the doctrine of reminiscence and the doctrine of ideas, which was in the end the doctrine of God.

But this humanistic theory does away with God and the supernatural world altogether, and leaves man alone with nature,—his own nature and the nature outside him. The way to refute this theory is not arbitrarily to offer a theology in the place of it, but to analyze its presuppositions and show that its view of human nature is too narrow. The history of Christian experience is of itself sufficient to show that man is so constituted as to receive supernatural help. Then too the investigations of the Psychical Research Society have furnished evidence, convincing to many educated and competent minds, that man has communicated with supernatural agencies. The psychologists, of course, undertake to explain these facts in terms of psychological experience. This brings us face to face with the "Ego-centric predicament," the fact that we cannot get outside our own thought in thinking, nor outside our own experience in experiencing. But we must reflect that psychological experience is something quite different from psychical experience. Psychical experience is what the psychologist interprets in terms of his psychology; and this leaves the truth of the interpretation still in question. There is a deeper analysis of human nature than what Humanism offers, and this analysis leads to the conclusion that man is not a self-existing, independent being. This is obvious as to his natural origin and his physical sustenance; it is also evident from his social relations. His mind is built up by the in-

fluence and communication of other minds. This places his mind in a community which furnishes a mental and moral atmosphere in which he lives and upon which he depends. All this the humanist would admit, though he is apt to forget it.

But there is a still deeper analysis. Man is not merely or primarily a mind as the humanist assumes, although he has Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas on his side. On the other hand, we may cite Plato, Plotinus, and Duns Scotus in favor of love, feeling, and will. Here Swedenborg's doctrine of love is fundamental and epoch-making. On this point the doctrine is, that love is the life of man, and that thought is the first effect of life, or love; and further, love and life are identical and co-extensive universally. Furthermore, universal and all-comprehensive love is God, the Creator, Sustainer, and Ruler of the "universe," natural and spiritual. The doctrine that God is love is fundamental to a complete understanding of man and the universe. Love is the creative principle of the universe, and all created things are the creatures, the embodiments, and the images of love. Under this law, man is a created, and therefore finite, recipient of Love; he has his existence from the Love which created him, and all his capacities and powers come from that Love. We may approach this from the side of an analysis of the nature of love itself. When we consider the range of love as we know it, we observe the indefinitely many kinds and degrees of love; for example, the love of husband and wife, of parents and children, of friends, of leaders and followers, of flowers, of nature in general, of poetry, art, and science; in fact, every conceivable object of thought is also an object of love (or of hate, which is perverted love). This result shows the universality of love; it also gives the basis for recognizing the various degrees of the comprehensiveness of love. For example, we have the universal love of knowledge, the love of science in general, the love of the physical sciences, of the biological sciences, of mathematics, of geometry or algebra,

the theory of equations, etc. Here we have an ascending grade of more and more comprehensiveness. The highest term of this series would be the love of the universe as a whole, and of every detail in it. This all-comprehensive and omnipresent love is the Love which God is. This line of argument is similar to the idealistic argument for the Absolute Experience. We know fragments of experience and a fragment implies a whole; we know ourselves as forms of experience limited in various ways; we know that we may enlarge our experience indefinitely; we form ideas of experience larger than any attainable by us. The love of all men is perhaps an example. These observations and reflections undermine the presuppositions of individualistic, and indeed of naturalistic, philosophy. They make it absurd to think of man as self-existent and independent, and self-sufficient. They also rob the atheist of the grounds of his denial of the existence of God.

Mr. Lippmann tries to maintain that the conditions of modern life and especially the advanced knowledge of the universe, make it impossible for the modern man to believe in God or in Divine Government. To him the principal and most conclusive ground for the denial of God is that the universe is one of unchanging law and order; but, it may be said, law and order in ordinary cases is taken as convincing evidence of the presence and operation of intelligence. In fact, it is on this principle that is based the famous and long standing cosmological argument for the existence of God. It may be, and probably is, true that modern conditions and modern science have misled superficial thinking into a denial of God; but when we reach the limits of present day science, especially in physics and biology, this ground of denial becomes more and more uncertain, because further positive knowledge of the physical universe seems to give a doubtful verdict. We may therefore dismiss the asserted grounds for unbelief as fictitious; they rest upon uncriticised presuppositions and upon a partial analysis of experience.

It is admitted by Mr. Lippmann that the loss of belief in God has been followed by confusion in morals and destruction of moral standards. The modern man is at sea morally; and not only that, but he finds himself without the disposition to believe in any fixed moral standard. The only standard that would be acceptable to him would be one developed out of his own experience. This is what Humanism undertakes to do. But having thrown overboard the traditional moral code and abolished the religious sanctions upon which it was built, Humanism finds itself without sure moral guidance and without the moral strength to hold to a regulated course of conduct. The effort to do without God is vain, for the reason that the denial of God's existence does not put an end to His existence. God exists in fact for the unbeliever as well as for the believer. He gives strength and light to the unbeliever in spite of his unbelief. But unbelief shuts off the light in proportion to the depth of the unbelief, and hinders the strength-giving entrance of Love. So the humanist puts himself at a fatal disadvantage both by his unbelief and by his truncated philosophy. He deprives himself of the advantage of an allegorical interpretation of the Bible, and reduces it to the level of a more or less interesting piece of natural history. He thereby loses the strength and certainty of the precepts of the Bible. Higher criticism has robbed the Bible of its authority and made it "no more than a revered collection of hypotheses which each man may reject or accept in the light of his own knowledge." The loss of the Bible has been irreparable, and the consequences have been disastrous. The modern world needs imperatively the restoration of the Bible; and its restoration depends upon showing that it is the supreme Divine message to men. But this message must be seen to be unequivocal. Swedenborg's doctrine of the spiritual sense makes the message unequivocal. Robert Ingersoll wrote that Swedenborg's doctrine of correspondence is the only thing that can save the Bible (see Introduction to Martin Van Buren Denslow's "Modern Thinkers"). The

principle of correspondence, which is grounded in the nature of things and is exemplified in all languages and in all forms of expression, when applied to the interpretation of the Bible relieves the allegorical method of its arbitrariness and its excesses, and gives to the interpretation the character of an exact science. For example, Swedenborg interpretating the spiritual meaning of the two lights in the story of creation, says that the sun corresponds to love and the moon to faith. This statement may be put to the test of experiment. Follow the word "sun" throughout the Bible and take it to mean, in the spiritual sense, love; the result will be that new light and significance will be given to every passage. It is important, however, to observe one precaution: the love may be good or bad according to the context. For example, towards the close of the Book of Revelation it is said "there shall be no need of the sun." Here "sun" means self-love. In the same way we might take innumerable other words, learn the correspondence, and follow them through the Bible with perfectly definite and uniform results. In other words, the principle of correspondence leads to a clear and exact interpretation of the spiritual meaning, and the Bible becomes in an intelligible sense the Word of God. Thus restored to the position of authority, the Bible may be once more used intelligently as the Divine guide to spiritual and moral life.

If we inquire further how the Bible has this character, we raise all the difficult and fundamental questions as to inspiration and revelation. All the answers center in the nature of love and in the relation of correspondence. The situation may be summarized in the statement that the Bible is so written that the Lord's Divine Love and Wisdom is represented by correspondence in the letter. In the letter, the Bible is the natural history of the Jewish race, written in terms of the knowledge and experience of the race; but under the Lord's guidance it was so written that the letter would correspond to and express the spiritual meaning intended. This spiritual meaning, so far as apprehended, has

been the light and support of Bible readers throughout the ages. Modern rationalization and sophistication have to a large extent destroyed this use of the Bible by undermining faith in it, making its meaning uncertain or merely unreliable race-history. The fact and law of correspondence furnishes a key which enables us to enter clearly and certainly into the spiritual meaning, and so restores the Bible with fuller understanding to the modern world.

Humanism recognizes and admits that it does not afford either certainty or authority; but in a half-hearted and inconsistent way it tries to make a virtue of its deficiencies in this respect. The only sanction it offers is that of willingness to follow the lead of mature knowledge and to recognize disinterestedness as the quality required for efficiency; but disinterestedness means unbiased, disciplined, and objective knowledge, and this again is the mark and instrument of maturity. Thus maturity is virtue, manliness; and as maturity is knowledge, we come back to the Socratic principle, virtue is knowledge. But the principle is true only in case of complete knowledge. Now we observe that Humanism offers nothing distinctive in its emphasis upon disinterestedness and maturity; both of these characters are commonplaces in the theory of morals, and at the same time they are advanced and high attainments. In the meantime we need a guide to steer our course from the ignorance of childhood to the maturity of manhood; we need a criterion by which to distinguish truth from error, good from bad. We need a guiding principle to enable us to "transform" and "outgrow" the affections of childhood; to determine when and how far we may indulge our natural impulses, appetites, and desires; and at what point to restrain and control them. Here Humanism is helpless; it can only believe and prophesy, trust in the inherent goodness of human nature and in its innate tendency to develop and improve. Presumably, Mr. Lippmann sees all this, but he is so obsessed by the spirit of re-action against traditional religion and morals that he yields to the childish temper of

rebellion and tries to throw off all restraint and compulsion. And yet he must and does yield to the compulsion of fact, opinion, and fashion, and rest his Humanism on the compulsion of events and conditions; but he repudiates all moral compulsion, the compulsion of settled principles and truth. For Humanism there are no settled principles and no such thing as truth. Humanism is blind self-assertion, and only makes itself plausible and apparently consistent with good sense by appropriating the "wisdom of the great teachers" and the commonplaces of traditional religion and morals.

There are, however, religious and moral principles which are not commonplaces. That God *is* Infinite Love, Wisdom, and Power, and that these operate throughout the universe of His creation, is not a commonplace, but a new and fundamental truth. That God through the relation of correspondence has given to men His messages of Divine truth in the Bible, is not a commonplace, but a new and fundamental truth about the relation between man and God; it makes it possible for us to have a more intelligent belief in Revelation. That God, as infinite Love, Wisdom, and Power, became man in our Lord Jesus Christ is in part at least a commonplace of Christian doctrine; but that the Lord through the process of Glorification, and by His Resurrection and Ascension, made perfect the union of the Human and the Divine in Him, and is ever more the one and only God of heaven and earth,—this is the new and fundamental doctrine of the Christian religion. That the Lord would come again in the fulness of time is a commonplace of Christian belief; but that He has come in the spiritual sense of His opened Word to the distinctly spiritual understanding and life of men is the new and fundamental truth about His present relation to His Church. There is a vague hope and expectation of a renewal of Christian life and thought by a new and fuller presence of the Lord to mankind. The truths here presented fulfil the requirements of the expected new age. Those who accept

these truths and live according to them are being formed by the Lord into His New Church, the New Jerusalem, seen by John in vision and in symbol descending from God out of heaven.

Mr. Lippmann's criticisms and rejections do not touch these principles and truths. He deals effectively with the natural-mindedness and the logical confusions of Christians; but he leaves, in spite of his denials, the fundamental principles of the Christian religion intact. Humanism is a truncated philosophy, an unprincipled ethics, and a blind and helpless naturalism.

LEWIS F. HITE.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

THE LOVE OF THE NEIGHBOR

The love of the neighbor, in one form or another, is a common experience and a common principle among men of every time and every clime. In Christianity, it is joined with the love of God, and these two are made the basic facts of religious life. Like all facts of human experience, this love, when followed out in the many directions and levels of its exercise, becomes exceedingly complicated. It may be expressed in a simple act of kindness or politeness, or in a friendly caution, or in a well matured course of conduct. Viewed in this light, it will be seen to include the whole range both of our activities in the outer world and of our affectional and intellectual life as well. So that it involves our highest and deepest emotions, and our most exalted ideals; for these have in view directly or indirectly the interests of our fellow men.

But the love of the neighbor has a still higher aspect. The command "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself," joins the love of God and the love of the neighbor by Divine authority. We are taught further, that love to the Lord and love to the neighbor are the two supreme loves of human life, and that love to the neighbor is derived from love to the Lord. This is of fundamental importance in our thought of love to the neighbor. A little development of the doctrine enables us to understand how love to the neighbor is derived from love to the Lord. We read: "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life"; and "For their sakes I sanctify Myself". Many other passages might be cited to show the Lord's love for

men. On the basis of such passages we are taught that the Lord *is* the love of all mankind, and that His love for men is the life of men. We love the Lord when in grateful acknowledgment we look to Him for life and all its blessings, and in faithful obedience carry out into life the love we receive from Him. But the love we receive from Him is the love of all men; therefore we receive His love of all men in our act of loving all men, and in less degree in our act of loving others as opportunity offers. This is the central fact of religious life; and according as we know and understand this central fact, our religious life develops in fulness, in breadth, and in height. This principle is expressed in the formula, "Influx is into effort", also in the form, "The Lord's love in us and for us is our love of the neighbor". In other words, the Lord loves others through us and through our love of others. The Lord loves us for our own sake as well as for the sake of others. The Lord's love of us for our own sake and as means of loving others is what makes us to be what we are. The religious importance of this is that in knowing and acknowledging the Lord's love and in living from it we are and do our best.

But if we refuse to know and acknowledge the Lord's love and turn from it, and insist upon living from and for ourselves, we pervert His love into channels of our own choosing and pursue the ways of wickedness and sin. This turns love for others into hate; making others serve us instead of making ourselves serve them. This our doctrines put in the form: there are two fundamental loves, love to the Lord and love to the neighbor; and love of self and love of the world are perversions of these. These are the four loves which men actually live from until they are regenerated by the power of the Holy Spirit, and the loves of self and of the world are made subservient to the two higher loves. This is the commonly received doctrine of Christendom, and the specifically acknowledged doctrine of the New Church; but it has never been practiced generally and consistently.

The love of the neighbor has, especially in recent times, been acclaimed, but often without clear acknowledgment of its deri-

vation from and dependence upon love to the Lord. It is the fashion of the day in some quarters to dissociate the two loves, and to make love to the neighbor in some form or other sufficient and supreme. Various forms of humanitarianism and socialism have militantly professed the supremacy of love to the neighbor under the name of love of fellow men. But in these cases human nature has been so understood as to enthrone egotism at the center of human life. In other words, love of the neighbor and love of self have not been clearly distinguished; and when they are not clearly distinguished, it is difficult or impossible to see any other than a selfish motive in human conduct; accordingly many have asserted and tried to maintain that no other motive is possible. But the experience of mankind, not to speak of Christian experience in particular, affords too many instances of self-control, self-denial, and unselfish devotion to the welfare of others to allow much serious acceptance of this selfish philosophy. The difficulty arises from a lack of distinction between the natural self and the regenerate, or spiritual, self. Every man's motive is, of course, his own; but he may act from a self-derived, natural, motive, or he may acquire and adopt motives presented by others. The latter is the case in all intelligent and willing obedience. The deepest issue is whether we are looking to self for our motives or taking our motives from the Lord's love, from His will and commandments; this makes the difference between living a merely natural life and living a religious, or spiritual, life.

There is abundant evidence to show that it is peculiarly difficult to live a religious life under modern conditions. There seems to be a fatal tendency in philosophy to Egoism, especially in the current prevalent philosophies. The natural sciences—physics, biology, and psychology—are apt to lead to naturalism and individualism, both of which are antipodal to religion. These philosophies of the day pervade and inspire our practical everyday life; so that although we recognize our obligation to live in accordance with the law of love to the neighbor, the presuppositions upon which our thought and conduct rest are really opposed to this principle. As a consequence we have the great

confusion which close observers recognize in modern life. This appears in the multitude of little things as well as in the things of worldwide importance. People who are earnest and loud in proclaiming the importance of neighborly love and in professing devotion to the welfare of mankind, often offend in these little particulars. Let us pause to consider the ways of neighborly love and some obvious violations.

From the point of view of convenience or inconvenience in ordinary life, perhaps punctuality is the chief of the little things in which the love of the neighbor is always involved. We all recognize the obligation to be punctual, and yet we too often neglect to meet our appointments promptly. This is more serious than casual reflection would indicate. Two persons make an appointment to meet at a certain time in a certain place. One is promptly on the spot; the other fails to appear. The first is patiently expectant, then begins to wonder what the explanation may be. Was there some misunderstanding as to time or place? Uncertainty and suspense grow, until finally the idea occurs that some other place might have been understood by the other; and this suggests leaving the place agreed upon, and taking the chance of meeting in the other place. In the meantime number two arrives, and finds no one. Then he begins to wonder. His uncertainty and suspense grow moment by moment, until he likewise goes off to meet his missing companion elsewhere. After much confusion and going back and forth, they may or may not meet. All this trouble grows out of neglect to make the effort to be prompt; in other words, out of lack of consideration for the feelings, the interests, and the convenience of others, which is a neglect of love to the neighbor. This same situation occurs again and again under various circumstances. A friend gives a bridge party. Some guests arrive promptly, others come a few minutes late; and now they are ready to begin, but several are still to appear. The hostess is anxious with uncertainty and suspense. Finally the delinquent ones appear, with most agreeable apologies. The whole trouble came from neglect to begin to get ready in time. Some interest of the moment or total lack of a sense of obligation resulted in dis-

comfort and disarrangement of the whole party, which had to be kept up an hour later than was intended to the inconvenience of hostess and guests. Proper consideration of the rights and privileges of others would in most of such cases avoid these disagreeable experiences. The only thing needed is a little intelligent love of the neighbor. Again, some people are habitually late at church, or at other public meetings where promptness is desired and important. Such people seem to be wholly unconscious of the disturbance and distraction they cause by walking up the aisles of the church and taking their seats in full view of the congregation engaged in worship. We cannot judge individuals, not knowing the peculiar circumstances; but it is safe to say that in most cases a little forethought and timely preparation would remove entirely such offenses. It goes back to the question of selfishness or love of the neighbor. A little feeling of obligation to exercise the love of the neighbor in these at first sight small matters would give practice and training in expressing love of the neighbor which would extend to larger and more difficult matters. The indifference involved in the habitual neglect of promptness goes back in the last analysis to an individualistic philosophy, the philosophy which asserts that there are acts of the individual which are no concern of others. In other words, whether I am late or early is nobody's business but my own; in general, my conduct within certain limits is my own business, and other people have no claim to interfere. A more liberal philosophy points to the fact that it is very difficult to mention any feeling, impulse, emotion, idea, or thought which does not directly or indirectly affect others. Often the tone of the voice will indicate friendship or enmity towards a certain person, and this may be propagated throughout the community. Feeling sooner or later expresses itself in thought or action both of which have reference to others.

We are taught that love to the neighbor in the narrowest sense is the love which leads to the proper care of the body. Whatever we do therefore to injure the body is a violation of the love of the neighbor. The reason for this is that the body is our instrument for usefulness to others, and therefore what

injures the body is an injury to others. This applies to such details of everyday living as eating and drinking, sleeping, clothing, exercise, recreation, work, etc. The principle that one should take the best care of one's body for the sake of his best work, is one form of the law of love to the neighbor, for our work is our way of being useful to others. This raises the issue between morals and aesthetics. Aesthetics says, take care of the body in order to enjoy health and the feeling of well being. Aiming at health alone narrows the view, and involves a narrow view of the means to health and of the standards of health. Health for health's sake, like pleasure for pleasure's sake, is a self-defeating principle. Health is most fully enjoyed as a means to the fuller enjoyment of being useful to others because the joy of the larger love is added. In general, pleasure and happiness are incidental to being useful—in Aristotle's language, the performance of one's highest function in the best way.

What is said of the body applies in a higher degree to the mind. The old Greek formula, "A sound mind in a sound body," expresses the ideal of health, but to this should be specifically added, for the sake of use. A certain amount of mental development and cultivation are involved in the work of our everyday life and in our social relations; but this needs to be supplemented by deliberate and systematic effort to develop and cultivate the higher and larger faculties, by the systematic pursuit of such studies as mathematics, physics, biology, the social and philosophical sciences, history and literature, and art. We should develop and elevate our tastes as well as our intuitions and rationality. For the love of the neighbor calls into play all our faculties; and the more these are cultivated and trained, the more useful we can be to the community in which we live. This is the theory of public education, from kindergarten to university.

The love of the neighbor is developed by degrees, and is exercised on higher and higher levels, or in larger and larger fields. Taking one's body and then one's mind as neighbor in the least form, the first extension is to husband and wife. This is the first proper exercise of the love of the neighbor; for the love of self,

whether body or mind, for the sake of self is the negation and opposite of love to the neighbor. The care of the body and mind is the love of the neighbor only when regarded as means to being useful to others. The mutual love of husband and wife is not only the first form of love to the neighbor, but it is fundamental to all other forms, and is that out of which the other forms grow. Plato undertook to draw up a scheme of human life in which there should be no husband and wife, and no development of this love into family love, and this into community love. The state was put in the place of husband and wife, and of family. But Plato's scheme was rejected by the common sense of mankind; the experiment has never been tried. After the mutual love of husband and wife follows the mutual love of parents and children. Children are the next stage of neighbor, and they are the common neighbor to the parents. Parents are next neighbors to children, and the children next neighbors to parents. From the family the love of the neighbor extends to the circle of relatives, friends, and the community. In the family, the mutual love of husband and wife is primary, central, and creative; it is expressed in love for the children, and the children re-act and reciprocate. So in the community, family love is primary, central, and creative. The community is the enlarged family. Family love is expressed in the community, and the community looks to the family as its origin and as the final object of its love. The State is a larger form of the community; and the community of states, or the whole of mankind, is the universal community. Each of these involves a larger, a more highly developed and a more highly organized love. So that it is quite proper to arrange them in a series of ascending degrees of love. Each lower term is preserved in the higher, and each higher is developed out of the lower. Family love is preserved in the higher degrees, and the higher degrees have their origin, directly or indirectly, from the family. This may be called the natural development of love; but this development is dependent upon a higher kind of love.

The love of husband and wife for the Lord's sake and for the sake of receiving His love as the source of their mutual love, is a superior love and is the love of the spirit. This spiritual love

as operative in all the degrees of the neighbor is the province of the Church throughout all these degrees. It follows, therefore, that the Church is the neighbor in the next higher degree after the human race, considered from the natural point of view. And inasmuch as the Church is the Lord's love as received by the spirit of man, and looks to the Lord for the love which makes it to be the Church, the Lord Himself is the Supreme Neighbor, and is to be loved above all the lower degrees of neighbor. According to our doctrines, this is the full meaning of love to the neighbor, and this is its relation to the love to the Lord.

We may of course admire this scheme and accept it as a true account of what we mean by love to the neighbor. At the same time we may violate this love on all the levels and in all the degrees. We may affirm it in words and in thought, and deny it in the conduct of life; and we do this when we live from self. The distinction between love to the Lord and its opposite, self-love, is fundamental for religion and morals. Self-love may expand along the same line as love to the neighbor. Husband and wife and children may be loved for the sake of self, as means to self-gratification and self-importance. So the community, small or large, may be loved for the sake of self, as a means of self-enlargement and self-exaltation. In short, the neighbor in general from highest to lowest may be loved for the sake of self. This form of self-love, which is the opposite to love of the neighbor, is called love of the world. In these expanded forms it is difficult to distinguish self-love from love of the neighbor, for the reason that they are often expressed in the same form of outward conduct. The test comes when the interest of the community is opposed to the interest of self, whether in fact or in appearance. As a consequence, it is difficult to apply external tests to violations of love to the neighbor. Nevertheless, violations of love to the neighbor are so common, and in many cases so habitual, that an incredible amount of injury is done to individuals and to the community without being traced to the proper source. Many injurious habits, personal and social, are maintained without public recognition or condemnation. Our aesthetic, moral, and intellectual judgments

are perverted by these habits. Self-gratification and self-indulgence are substituted for the standards and requirements of love to the neighbor. In the fully developed scheme of love to the neighbor the more comprehensive love dominates the less comprehensive, or, to put it otherwise, the less comprehensive is subordinated to the more comprehensive. Swedenborg says that the spiritual sense of the Bible is universal, that it is not limited to persons, or nations, or to times, but has reference to common characters to be found in all persons, and nations, or times. This means that the Lord's universal love for men controls and directs the loves of the various degrees of the neighbor, and that love is to be our ultimate standard. This love is revealed in the Bible, in its spiritual sense.

LEWIS F. HITE.

THE NEW CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL GOSPEL.

It was refreshing and heartening to read in the *New-Church Herald* of July 27, 1929, an article by the Rev. Edwin Fieldhouse seeking to arouse us to the opportunity and to the obligations of the New Church in the field of the Social Gospel.

The article begins:

> The world is faced with social problems that clamor for some solution; problems not only of a purely local or national character, but also of an international character which must be solved ere long if the peace of the world is to be maintained. It is not my intention in this paper to go deeply into the question of the solution of these problems. I am confident that the New Church has a very definite contribution to make towards their solution, and I am hopeful that the Conference Committee on "Social Service" may in time formulate and present in definite and adequate form that contribution.
>
> My immediate purpose is to sketch the present-day attitude towards social science and social service, especially the attitude of the Churches generally, and to endeavor to stimulate a more lively interest on the part of our own body and particularly of its leaders in these same problems.

Towards the close of his article, after expressing the feeling that in our teachings about the Larger Neighbor, the Maximus

Homo, and Use, the Church has unique material for a more adequate statement of the Social Gospel than this has yet had, Mr. Fieldhouse says:

> It certainly leaves me with a very strong conviction that the New Church is neglecting a very important duty in failing to demonstrate to the world the Social Gospel she possesses.

Are we not forced either to grant this, or to take the position that the New Church possesses no Gospel rightly so described?

Mr. Fieldhouse sketches first of all the birth and growth of the interest in a social application of the standards of Christianity. He is treating of the history which the movement has had in his own country: in the burst of "Christian Socialism" in such men as Maurice and Kingsley; later in the more nearly organic interest of the Church itself in such representatives as Hugh Price Hughes and Dr. Gore; and in the agencies of social service which arose to care for this interest while the Church was awaking to its opportunity and duty. This history in England could be matched with a similar history, with slightly later dates, in this country. The whole story is well told in an informing work, "An Outline of Christianity," Volume iv, Book iii.

Our British friend points out how especially the secularization of life, the world over, has led and practically forced the Church to put forward the claims of religion on the same large scale upon which our other interests operate. The missionary Gospel, if it is to conquer the kingdoms of the world for the kingdom of Christ, must have its social implications as well as its demands upon the individual conscience. Mr. Fieldhouse quotes some revealing formulations of this socially-minded Christianity,—the findings, for example, of the World Conference of Missionaries held on the Mount of Olives in 1928. He says that in such formulations Christian representatives of all sorts are "hammering out a social and individual Gospel suited to the times and states of men today, which approximates to an amazing extent to the New-Church Gospel." We think that any one who will acquaint himself with the whole movement

and with its literature and achievements will join Mr. Fieldhouse in this estimate of what is being done.

In the statement of the New-Church message on this head, the little posthumous treatise called "The Doctrine of Charity" probably takes first place. That small book is at once a handbook of personal religion and an outline of a social Gospel. Its significance is, in our judgment, more usefully and more fully worked out (with no acquaintance with the book) in such a pair of discussions as Fosdick's "The Meaning of Service" and Rauschenbusch's "The Social Principles of Jesus" than the New Church has seen fit to do it. The reconstruction of Christian theology which has been in progress for many years now—any participant would bear witness—has proceeded in the light of what we call the conception of the Larger Neighbor; in other words, with a view to a social application of the second great commandment.

Two objections are usually raised when it is proposed to utilize more adequately our own teachings on this great head.

One is that the Church's effort is then diverted to social reforms, and these do not lie in the province of her true function, which is the arousing and educating of the spiritual life of mankind. It will readily be granted by all exponents of the Social Gospel that reforms, if specific political and other measures are meant, are not in the Church's province. But while specific reforms are outside her purview, social reform surely is a deep concern of hers. Even then, it is true, there are boundaries to observe in her effort to deal with social problems. This is inescapably plain the minute a worker appreciates the technical information which he must have in order to attempt a sociological or economic solution. That there are boundaries is plain to any one who realizes what the spiritual life is, and that this it is to which the Church must cleave. But is not the spiritual life to find expression in our industrial and other social life as well as in the individual regeneration? Just what is the spiritual life which we profess to have, which is not irked by the injustices in society? The Church is still to pursue its one objective, therefore,—the realization and educa-

tion of the spiritual life,—but to seek this in its larger forms as well as in the smaller forms of individual regeneration. It is not true to say that the Church, in such a pursuit, abandons its business, and is diverted to mere social reform.

The other usual objection is, that we must not forget the fact that the Christ and regeneration come to us an individual at a time. We do not undergo regeneration *en masse*. Individual regeneration shall not be lost from the Christian Gospel, or overlooked. There may be danger of this, although no one probably proposes anything of the kind. But if danger there is, the exponents of the Social Gospel are alive to it, as well as the man who in fact is opposed to the Christianizing of the social order. They are capable of stating the danger as forcefully as any objector to the Social Gospel. They provide against the risk. Certainly they do not let go of the Gospel to the individual in taking up in addition the Gospel of social redemption. Any current literature of the movement would serve to enforce the statement. The very spirit for this social redemption will come individual by individual. "We should not look for such change of spirit to arise from any simultaneous conversion of men in masses" (Christ and Society, Gore, p. 2).

It is more than a little amazing that in the middle of the eighteenth century, before the development of modern industrial machinery, of the factory system, of trusts and syndicates, of class and group and international consciousness, of the larger self-conscious societies in general which mark our civilization, Swedenborg should have apprehended and outlined the Christian message in terms of larger neighbors, of Christian obligations owing between them, of a social conscience. Here is one of the most truly distinctive aspects of his teaching. Here is one of the most startling evidences that he was called to speak the Christian message for a new day, or, as he said, "for a new Church." Here is one of the surest lines of demarcation between old and new: the individualistic Gospel is old; the Gospel which is individual and social, is new. Under a kind of wordless tuition of the Spirit, Christian thinkers, with material from the New Testament chiefly, and under the pressure of a new

civilization, have been "hammering out" a socially minded and socially efficient Gospel. But long before they did so, explicit guidance to such a Gospel was at hand in Swedenborg's Theological Works. The "Doctrine of Charity" cries aloud to the same effect as a report of an Anglican Committee, whose findings Mr. Fieldhouse quotes, the first two of which we reproduce:

1. That the Social Teaching of the Church is an essential part of its witness.
2. That Christian Ethics are binding upon Social Relations as well as upon Individual Conduct.

The germ and outline of such a Gospel, and the impulse to it, have lain in the Theological Works, fairly unabsorbed by the mind of the New Church. It is some gain that the British Conference, after an examination into COPEC, could not let its interest drop, but now has a committee to study the relation and the duty of the New Church to all this professing and timely side of the Christian message.

If the New Church should take its part in this apprehension and presentation of the Christian Gospel, many good results may be predicted with some confidence. The fresh and more timely hold upon its own teachings, and the more daring and constructive loyalty to them, would act as a tonic on our own body. There would be a new intellectual activity and a new access of zeal, set upon some great goals. We should also be speaking to the contemporary interest in religion, and should come to have an appeal which, we will all confess, we do not now have, nor can have with a Gospel less meaningful to the present day. And is it not very likely that if the New-Church message goes out as a Gospel for individual and society, that the work of the Church will re-engage the spirit of adventure of our youth, and answer our young people's longing for a religion which tells in the betterment of the present world, and not only of another world? Young men and young women today, dreaming of achieving something for mankind's greater well-being, enter in large numbers on the work of various idealistic and social agencies, understanding that the Church

gives them little opportunity of the kind. The ministry of a Social Gospel would re-attract workers to the Church.

Just as it was refreshing and heartening to come upon Mr. Fieldhouse's moderate and strong-hearted appeal on this question in the *New-Church Herald,* it was good to read words to much the same general effect in an editorial by the Rev. Adolph L. Goerwitz in his *Die Neue Kirche* of January, 1929. We reproduce the whole editorial in translation:

Is the New Church for these times? On January 29 it will be two hundred and forty-one years since Swedenborg was born, through whom there was given to the world by the Lord the inner sense of the Divine Word, and with it the teaching of the New Christian Church. Since that time powerful winds have blown over mankind, earthquakes have shaken the spiritual foundations, so that "not one stone has been left upon another." Can anything which arose in such different conditions do justice to the present day? Then dogmatic questions were in the focus of interest, as they were a hundred years later, indeed, to an extent, up to the World War. Today, beside technical questions, it is chiefly social and economic problems which occupy the foreground. Can the New Church meet these quite altered conditions and shifts?

Any one who considers the New Church a dogmatic proposition or movement may have his doubts of this; but any one who has grasped her leading principle that "all religion has relation to life, and that the life of religion is to do good," realizes that such a Church can never belong to yesterday, but is always today's church, because she always leads her followers to a clear dealing with the question: How can I discharge my task and calling under the conditions obtaining? For answer to this vital question she furnishes him with clear points of view, above all with the wholly new guidance that active love does not consist in benefactions, but, in the very first place, in a man's discharging his office, calling, and duty uprightly, honestly, and scrupulously. Who does not see how much social sickness is bound to be cured, from within out, in a living observance of this principle?

For the purification and cure of the spiritual life many mistaken teachings, it is true, must disappear, for the conquest of which the New Church gives a firm footing. The human being is created for eternal life; and straight through changes of temporal circumstance, it is vital that he should procure for himself clearness on the loftiest questions of existence from deep and pure sources of information—from the Word of God to mankind, which has remained his available Divine gift of light.

It is difficult to believe that an understanding of the Gospel will fail to appeal to us which can be put in words like the following:

> Jesus Christ is really the Savior and Redeemer of Mankind, in its social as well as its individual life, and in the present world as well as in that which is to come: and there lies upon those who believe in Him a responsibility which cannot be exaggerated to be true to the principles which He taught, and by all available means to bring them to bear upon the whole life of any society of which they form a part, especially when it professes the Christian name. (Christ and Society, Gore, p. 5.)

William F. Wunsch.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

HOW THE NEW CHURCH REGARDS THE VIRGIN MARY.

There are several songs of praise in the Bible for the Lord's mercies. There is the song of Moses and the song of Miriam after Israel's deliverance from the Egyptians at the Red Sea; there is the song of Deborah and Barak after Israel's deliverance from Sisera; and there is the song of Hannah, the mother of Samuel. This strongly resembles the song of Mary in the first chapter of Luke. Here we have the only two songs of the Gospels—that of Mary and that of Zacharias, both celebrating the great event so long expected, for which the human heart had longed, and which had been prophesied from the beginning, as Zacharias says:

> As He spake by the mouth of the holy prophets, *who have been since the world began,* that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us. (Luke i, 70, 71.)

A remarkable work by an English statesman, Arthur James Balfour, entitled "The Foundations of Faith," shows clearly that while the coming of the Lord on earth is unexplainable to the reason, it is this one great fact which, far more than any other, succeeds in interpreting human life and lifting man above all his troubles. As Mr. Balfour says, the telescope, showing the immensity of the universe, seems to hide from view this seemingly little event in an obscure corner of this obscure world. But he rightly, clearly, and modestly perceives that this is a materialistic judgment,—a judgment from below, from the senses, from the outward appearance. It is the exaltation of space and matter over spirit. The Lord's coming exalts the spirit above matter. A part of the secret of the manger and the poverty of the birth at Bethlehem is to reverse the appear-

ance, to deny the truth of arrogant human greatness, or of human reason that is based on materialism, and, in the words of the song, to "put down the mighty from their seats," and to "exalt them of low degree." Thus, according to the original prophecy of the Incarnation in Eden, the seed of the woman bruises the head of the serpent, which includes within its meanings the sensual reason which, like the serpent, drags its whole length in the dust of materialism, and which tempts men today even more than of old. Think upon it, pray over it, you who have troubles about the Incarnation. The clear, beautiful answer will come, and you will rejoice with Mary and with the angels of Bethlehem, at the birth of a new and Divine thought.

Getting a glimpse, then, of the magnitude of meaning in the Incarnation, which has to do with all time in this world, if not with all worlds, why should the Virgin Mary, in her inspired song, seem to dwell so much upon herself as to say:

> He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden: for, behold, from henceforth all generations shall call *me* blessed. For He that is mighty hath done to *me* great things.

It expresses the feeling of the Jewish motherhood of that day; for, full of the faith that the promised deliverer was to be born among their nation, we are told that many a Jewish mother in the royal line of David was wont to cherish hopes that she might be the mother of Israel's greatest king. In this regard, then, Mary the mother of Jesus was not far above the state of the ordinary Jewish mother.

How, then, can her words be Divinely inspired; and why should words Divinely inspired, as we believe the words of her song to be, fall in with Mary's exultation *in her own elevation above others*, and in the thought that all nations would call *her* blessed?

We know how the Church of Rome has answered this question; namely, by supposing that the Virgin Mary, before she could be the mother of so holy a Being, must herself be first purged of all human infirmities by Divine provision, and made immaculate, or free from all sin or sinful tendencies. This is the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, as proclaimed in

the nineteenth century. Hence Mary shares in some sense and degree the holiness and blessedness of her Divine Son, and becomes in some sense a Mediator between man and his Redeemer. Hence her picture is everywhere to be seen in places of devotion, and her altar rises in every Romish church chancel by the side of the altar of the Savior, and her name is invoked in such a way as must imply that she shares the Divine life and favor in a peculiar sense; and that, in the words of her song, "henceforth all generations shall call *me* blessed."

But we see that this implies, not merely the need of a Divine intercessor with God the Father, but a human intercessor with the Divine intercessor; and below her the Saints to be intercessors with her, the whole forming a kind of ladder of steps leading up to God and His holiness.

In distinction from all this stands out the New-Church doctrine, that Jesus Christ is God manifest; that He needs no intercessor, but comes Himself to save mankind from sin and worldliness, that in His Divine and glorified nature He is pure love and wisdom in perfect union, dwelling forever near to men; that He can be directly approached by all; and that all who approach Him in spirit and in truth will receive real help, namely, deliverance from all things that stand in the way of salvation, or the establishment of a heavenly state of mind. "His name shall be called Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, *"God with us."*

But in His earthly advent, He must take upon Himself all human finiteness and imperfection. So far from Mary being purged of all this imperfection before she could bear Him, this would have unfitted Him for His mission, which required that He should be clothed with human finiteness and imperfectness so that He could be tempted in all points by Satan or the devil, which means the whole evil power of the hells, which at that time was so overwhelming that man could bear it no longer without destruction. In this the fullness of time God came, received into His finite nature the temptation not only to do evil, but to choose the life of the world and to believe the word of the serpent of materialistic reason. He bore and over-

came through the presence of the Father or the Divine Soul within Him, which was not from Mary, but was God alone, who did the works, and spoke the words, the lower nature freely consenting and cooperating. And we are taught that, as this work of overcoming the hells went on, the finite and assumed nature with all its infirmities was put off, and was replaced with Divine qualities. Thus was Jesus Christ, when made Divine, fully united in personal unity of consciousness with the Divine Father, enabling God, through His presence in this glorified earthly nature, to dwell forever near to and approachable by all mankind. But with the glorification all that He took from the human race through Mary was put off forever, so that He was no longer, in any sense, her Son.

Personally, we think of the Virgin as doubtless peculiarly protected and prepared for her sacred mission—a noble mother, but nothing more. The surface meaning of her words of self-exultation is to be explained as so many other things in the Bible are. For the surface of the Divine Word is clouded by being adapted to the imperfections of those to whom it first came, while the spirit remains unclouded. "To the pure thou wilt shew thyself pure, and to the froward thou wilt shew thyself froward." As a mere person, Mary doubtless felt something of that spirit common to all Jewish mothers, breaking forth into exultation in the angelic assurance that in her the hope of the ages would be fulfilled.

But Mary's song is inspired. The Divine wisdom and power made use of her natural feelings to convey a holy and universal lesson. There is spirit and life within all Divine words, even when clouded by human evils. In this, as in other respects, God maketh the wrath of man to praise Him. We will consider briefly, in conclusion, what this deeper meaning is.

But first let us see how the view of Mary which has been presented accords with the gospel teaching — indeed, the Savior's own constant teaching that she is by no means to be regarded as an object of prayer or intercessor. While we cannot think of Him as addressing her otherwise than tenderly, we must be either ignorant or wilful if we fail to be impressed

with the fact that after a certain period in His career He acknowledged her no more as His mother. In putting off all the nature which He took from her, He put away even the title "mother." At the marriage in Cana, when she told Him of the lack of wine, He gently reproved her: "Woman, what is it between me and thee?" When He was told that His mother and brethren were outside, desiring to speak with Him, He said: "My mother and my brethren are those who hear the Word of God and do it." And again, upon the cross, seeing His mother, He again called her "woman," and commended her to John, saying, "Woman, behold thy son," and to John, "Behold thy mother," giving her into his charge.

And this we find in the writings of the Herald of the New Church:

> Once, Mary the mother of the Lord passed by, and was seen overhead in white raiment; and then, stopping a while, she said that she was the mother of the Lord, and that He was indeed born of her; but that He, being made God, put off all the human element taken from her; and that, therefore, she now adores Him as her God; and that she is unwilling that any one should acknowledge Him for her son, since in Him all is Divine. (True Christian Religion, n. 82.)

Kindly as we may wish to feel towards all religious organizations, and while we must acknowledge the Divine Providence in their errors, the truth, which should be supreme above all kindly feelings, requires that we should not overlook the falsities of a corrupt age. The same spirit which ascribed to Mary personal qualities of holiness, thereby detracting from the One who alone is holy, caused the Church to recognize personal holiness in those who administered the affairs of the Church, apart from their office or use. "Once a bishop always a bishop," whether exercising the functions of the bishop or not. The person of the king, too, was sacred, apart from his office. It was a great step when the barons of England compelled the acknowledgment of a *law* above the king. And whatever may be said of our own government's defects or weaknesses, it is a far more *interior* form of government than the monarchical, since it clearly recognizes a law separate from

and superior to the officials who make it or execute it; which law becomes a *visible and tangible thing* in a written Constitution, unlike even the English law in this regard. The principles of truth, or right, or love to man as adapted to earthly needs, are thus made supreme, above all human personality, and thus brought into harmony with the thought of God, who alone is Good and True.

What, then, finally, is the deeper meaning of Mary's song? What is the inspired meaning, which remains when all that is superficial and personal has been eliminated? In brief, it is this: Mary is a type of the church, in heaven and on earth—the "communion of saints," as it has been called, or, as the Book of Revelation calls it, "the Bride, the Lamb's Wife." Mary's rejoicing is the rejoicing of all in the heavens and of all good men on earth at the advent of Him for whom their souls had longed from the beginning. We are clearly taught that the Savior's birth into the world was but the closing scene of a preparation of ages. The body which He took from Mary was but the clothing and containing vessel of an invisible body of human states of mind, human longings, human infirmities of thought and affection, taken on in all ages past—taken from all the angels in heaven, taken from all men on earth. He had been descending, clothing himself with human thoughts, and bringing to all a desire to realize His glory, for ages. All creation, in an important sense, was thus the mother who bore Him. Mary but gave to this an earthly body. Hence the words of the Epistle to the Romans: "All creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." In the deeper sense of the song, Mary only expressed the joy of the angels at His birth shown in their song to the shepherds, "Glory to God in the highest," and the answering songs of rejoicings of the waiting multitudes of earth, voiced in the words of the aged Anna the prophetess, who had waited for Him with prayers night and day, and who gave thanks at His presentation in the temple; and voiced again in the words of the aged Simeon: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen

thy salvation." Mary's words of praise are especially *the words of the church of God,* which she stands for; and when we rise above the mere personality of the surface, we find her song in harmony with the song of the angels, heard by John, "Thou *alone* art holy," and with their act, which John describes, of casting their crowns before His throne, saying, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power." Mary's song, "all nations shall call *me* blessed," is the song of the church of the ages, typified by the words of Malachi respecting Israel, or the church of God: "All nations shall call you blessed, for ye shall be a delightsome land, saith the Lord of hosts." And more personally to us, it is the song of each human soul when the Savior's light and life appear through our trials, exhibiting the inward process of regeneration, or *when He is born within us,* giving us a new consciousness of life's real meaning. In this sense, our life here is a period of travail and pain, until we are prepared to hear the voice of Gabriel, who comes to bring us glad tidings; and to hear Elizabeth's words to Mary, "Blessed shall they be who believe, for there shall be a performance of those things which are told them from the Lord." Practically, we need this belief in God our Savior; and when we are prepared for it, our hearts shall sing for joy.

JOHN GODDARD.

THE THEOLOGICAL WORKS AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE

1. INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATIONS

The mere existence of an important text means that there will be study of it. If this text exists in a number of manuscripts which not only offer variations of reading but which are of unequal value, the study of the text is bound to become an extended one. Textual criticism in general is an inevitable and legitimate study. When it comes to the text of the Bible, this is by all odds the most important text we have. It has been brought down to us in a large number of manuscripts,

versions, and printed Bibles; and it would seem that in proportion as the Bible is rated high, the study of its text will be valued the more, and will the more surely engage a body of students.

Textual study of the Bible may be complicated by the abundance of the materials for it, but it has a single, clear-cut object—the determination of the best attested text at all points.

Some of us, from Mr. Hindmarsh's day onward, have felt that we have the best text of Scripture in the Masoretic text (for the Old Testament) and the Received Text (for the New Testament). Indeed, such of us have felt that to this text we are held.

The reasons are not far to seek. The whole biblical world entertained the same feeling about this text once, down to the later decades of the nineteenth century. It was the prevalent conviction in Swedenborg's day. It found strong expression (as respects the Masoretic text) in the preface to one of the Hebrew Bibles which he used. Swedenborg himself, in his work as relevator of the Word's spiritual sense, utilized this best available text. That would seem to stamp it as the true text in all respects. On this we shall say more presently. Of this text, moreover, he made such statements as these:

> Hence it is that it has been effected of the Lord's Divine Providence, that the Word as to the literal sense, from its first revelation, has not been mutilated, not even as to a word or even a letter in the original text; for every word is a support, and, in some degree, even a letter. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1085(3).)

Again, without specification of the Old Testament, he says:

> For this reason, also, under the Lord's Divine Providence, it has come to pass that the Word, and chiefly the Word of the Old Testament, has been preserved as to every jot and point from the time when it was written. It has also been shown (to me) out of heaven, that not only every expression, but also every syllable, and what seems incredible, every least curve of a syllable, in the Word, involves, in the original tongue, something holy, which is rendered perceptible to the angels of the inmost heaven; that such is the case I am able to assert positively, but I know that it transcends belief. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9349 (2).)

See similar and related passages in "Doctrine of the Sacred

Scripture" n. 13e, "De Verbo" n. 4e, "Last Judgment" n. 41e, "Divine Providence" n. 260 (3).

We have come away with different conclusions from these passages and from these facts ever since Mr. Noble and Mr. Hindmarsh did so in a discussion in the 1820's.

Some of us have felt that such statements as we have quoted closed discussion. They mean that in the Masoretic text and the Received Text we are in possession of the best text of Scripture. If so, it would be a welcome relief from a taxing and intricate study which calls for much knowledge and skill, and which in itself assumes the proportions of a life-work. On the other hand, we should have the greater burden of contending, against an ever increasing and increasingly convincing mass of evidence, that biblical scholarship is on a wild-goose chase, and has erroneously abandoned the Masoretic text and the Received Text as the best preserved text of Scripture.

Others of us, and among them some of our best Bible men like Noble and Bruce, have reacted very differently to the facts and statements we quoted above. They have welcomed the taxing work of textual criticism. They have not felt that this work was rendered superfluous by the existence, ignored by scholarship, of an all-sufficient text in Masoretic text and Received Text.

To see our way for ourselves in the matter, we need to consider the force and the character, an incidental reference, too, of the statements quoted above from the "Arcana Cœlestia" and the "Apocalypse Explained," and other statements like them, which purport to commend to us these texts as the accurately preserved Scripture text, sure down to the single word, even to the letter, or as a text that has not been "mutilated." (In the passage from "Apocalypse Explained" Swedenborg had first written "changed", but substituted "mutilated.")

It is well to reflect what gives weight to these statements of Swedenborg. He is endowed with insight into the spiritual sense which pervades Scripture, and so endowed, he finds the text before him not only adequate for the purposes of exposition of that sense but, seemingly, the accurately preserved text, at

any rate preserved without "mutilation." Having to expound the spiritual sense which pervades the sense of the letter to the single word and sometimes to the individual letter, he finds the Masoretic text and the Received Text to his purpose. It is his insight into the deeper sense of Scripture and its satisfaction with the text before it, which really gives weight to the statements which we have quoted. We shall ask whether this insight could not have been satisfied with a trustworthily transmitted text, though not a flawless one.

Even those who think his statements end discussion, agree, in the abstract, that there is no statement of Swedenborg's which is to be subscribed to just because he made it. These statements are not given their weight simply because they emanate from him. This is still clearer if they are of the character which we feel (in our discussion below) we have to ascribe to them.

On one other thing, obviously, these statements do not depend for their weight. That is textual study, which is the immediate and thorough basis for such statements to rest on. Textual study was only beginning in Swedenborg's day in the form in which we now know it. The data for it in some of the oldest manuscripts were not at hand. Had he himself undertaken textual study, moreover, on the basis of the available material, he would have been carried far afield. It is to be assumed that he felt confident in general that in the text before him the Scripture had been faithfully enough preserved for his purposes of expounding the spiritual sense of the Word. The effort to determine with minuteness the most reliable reading at any point in the Bible would have occupied an unconscionable length of time. Even now, after a hundred and fifty years have been spent on the inquiry, and hundreds of skilful and industrious scholars have pursued the inquiry, while a vast amount of information has been heaped up, much remains still to do. Anyone acquainted with the results and with the unsolved questions of textual criticism appreciates how far afield Swedenborg would have been taken had he attempted

this order of study, especially at a time when the materials for it were scanty.

So much for what does and what does not give weight to Swedenborg's mooted statements. But just what is the character of these statements?

We have in the Theological Works a revelation, but a revelation of the doctrines of the spiritual life. This revelation does not include every statement made in these Works. Here, for example, are statements which have to do with the condition of a text which has been transmitted to us from early times, in documents which are open to examination by anyone who will attempt this particular study of textual criticism. The condition of the text in these documents is a fact, and any statement made on the subject can only be a statement of what is fact or of what turns out on examination not to be fact. We are all aware of other subjects which are touched on in the Theological Works, and which similarly are not subject matter of revelation. The statements on them we see readily enough are statements of fact, of information gained by ordinary channels. When Swedenborg recites the history of a creed, it is a recital of what was known about the history of that particular creed. When he speaks of the lack of rhetorical power and brilliance in the Scripture books, he is reproducing a prevailing idea about the literary character of those books. If he gives the date for the life of a certain man, this surely is not to be taken as a matter on which we have any revelation. At "True Christian Religion" n. 840, he makes a reference to Augustine, who, he says, was bishop of Hippo in the third century. Of course this was miswriting. The date is two centuries out of the way. But right or wrong, we should be confusing matters to consider that because Swedenborg speaks out on the matter in the Theological Works, his statement has become something more than statement of fact or of what turns out not to be fact. So of the condition of a text preserved to us in a large number of documents, documents which the scholar can acquaint himself with and collate and evaluate. There is no making a statement of such an observable fact which will not

retain the character of a statement of fact subject to criticism in the light of a direct examination of the matter concerned. It also only embarrasses his actual revealed doctrine about the Word to confuse with it a statement of fact on the integrity of the Scripture text.

There is one truth in the mooted statements, or stated in connection with them, which is, of course, not under discussion at all. This is the truth that the spiritual sense of the Word pervades the books of the Word to the individual expression and even to the letter. This is a truth revealed to Swedenborg. It means that, given the accurate text of Scripture, we would have a text so pervaded; if we have not the accurate text at all points, we are all the more interested to seek it. This high truth about the spiritual sense and its relation to Scripture is unquestioned and not under discussion. Nor is the sufficiency of his text for his general purpose of expounding the spiritual sense in question.

Finally, an incidental reference in Swedenborg's assertions about the biblical text deserves a word. He finds an evidence of Providence in the verbally accurate preservation of the text of Scripture. Such preservation was deemed the fact, and he avails himself of it. Suppose the scholarship of his day, like that of our day, had thought only that the Scripture text had been preserved with incredible trustworthiness. Would that not have been ample satisfaction of the thought of Providence,—the fact that in the large number of manuscripts of the Bible with their thousands of variants, the text of Scripture has been preserved with all trustworthiness and with ample data for restoring it where it is broken or corrupted? Is there any question that this general and really marvelous trustworthiness of the Scripture text would have satisfied Swedenborg in illustration of the Providence over the preservation of Scripture? A strained but generally accepted notion of how Providence had utilized the Masorites interposed itself, and was used instead in illustration. I think we are obliged to reflect that the other idea is really the more satisfying illustration. For Providence never reaches to the point where the fallible is rendered infallible.

All these reflections leave room for the studies called textual criticism. They allow for investigation of the condition of the Scripture text, and for those studies in general. The upshot of textual criticism can be put briefly in two statements. The one statement is constructive enough for anyone; namely, that these studies assure us, on the ground of examined fact, as we cannot be assured apart from them, of the general and marvelous trustworthiness of the Scripture text. The other statement, more often obtruded on public notice, is that the text is accurately preserved to the last particle in no single recension, nor in all taken together, but often where disturbed is open to restoration or convincing emendation. The general position, of course, of the textual student is that the most reliable text is a work of the future, to be reached through study of all that available testimony in manuscripts, versions, and printed editions, to which Swedenborg himself, as we shall see, waves his reader at "Apocalypse Revealed" n. 95. That the text has come down to us without the loss of a word would be made impossible of belief to us by the existence of one or two gaps in text; many, however, can be cited, though relatively to the text as a whole they are extremely few. One of our own controversialists has maintained it has been "quantitatively" preserved. But the number of years in two places in I Samuel xiii. 1, for example, has been lost.

Indeed, not only have our reflections so far on the mooted statements in Swedenborg allowed standing for textual criticism. If we proceed to study Swedenborg's own practice in handling the text before him, this coincides better with the findings of textual criticism than with his mooted statements, when these are stood upon rigidly and without reflection. He feels free to deviate from what we would then presume is the accurately preserved text—Masoretic text and Received Text.

Let us look at a few specimens of Swedenborg's own practice. At Deuteronomy xxvii. 22 we read, in the Authorized Version, as follows: "The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting, and with mildew; and they shall pursue thee until thou perish." This an-

swers to the Masoretic text. The item in question is the word which in the Authorized Version is rendered "sword." "Sword" it is in the Masoretic text. The sequence of thought in the literal sense demands a calamity in nature at this point; and when Swedenborg comes to translate, as at "Arcana Cœlestia" n. 8364, he writes "drought" (in keeping with the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Vulgate). The Hebrew, so far as the consonants are concerned, is unaltered whether one reads "drought" or "sword"; but the Masorites, to whom accurate preservation of Scripture is ascribed, have pointed the letters to form the word "sword" rather than the word "drought." Here is one departure on Swedenborg's part from the Masoretic text in the matter of the vocalizing of the consonantal text, though this vocalizing was part of the work (under Providence) of the Masorites.

So again there is departure from even the consonantal Masoretic text. If we will turn to our Authorized Version at Amos iii. 12, we shall read at the end of the verse: "and in Damascus on a couch." If we turn to the Revised Version, we shall read: "on the silken cushions of a bed." If we turn to "Arcana Cœlestia" n. 6188, we shall read: "on the end of a couch." The mooted word in the Masoretic text occurs only here in the Old Testament. The meaning of it is undecipherable. When the Authorized Version reads "Damascus," it has altered the word in the Masoretic text. When the Revised Version says "on the silken cushions of a bed," it assumes that the word in the Masoretic text has some reference to Damascus, and that the reference is that certain stuffs, certain silken goods, came from Damascus,—both unsupported assumptions. But then comes Swedenborg, and doubtless following insight into the deeper meaning, he sets down a word for which there is no equivalent in the text at all. If he has the accurately preserved text before him, he could not make this most obvious departure from it. On the other hand, the text is not accurately preserved, unless we are willing to say that it never made sense.

Of course it has long been appreciated that one of the most revealing, if not the most revealing, passage of all in the Theo-

logical Works on this matter of textual criticism is the closing sentence of "Apocalypse Revealed" n. 95. Swedenborg has before him the words of Revelation ii. 9: "I know thy works, and tribulation and poverty (but thou art rich)." In the "Apocalypse Explained" he had given a spiritual meaning to *all* these words. Now in the "Apocalypse Revealed" he leaves the words enclosed in parenthesis uninterpreted. He is led to do this because they have been enclosed in marks of parenthesis, and are so enclosed in his Schmidius Bible; and he takes the marks to mean that the words are omitted in certain manuscripts. He has misread the significance of the marks of parenthesis. The thought of the words is an actual parenthesis. The words are not missing from any known manuscript of the book of Revelation. Dr. Wright has somewhere said that they are missing from the manuscript known as "L"; but this is not among the manuscripts containing the book of Revelation. There are many reflections which can be rested on this single and significant passage. We must remember that Swedenborg's insight into the spiritual sense was there to serve him. He also had before him what was considered the accurately preserved text of the New Testament. And yet despite both, he refers to another order of testimony as the criterion in what is to be regarded as the most reliable reading of Scripture at any point, namely the testimony of the manuscripts. If one feels that he must have warrant from the Theological Works for what is an inevitable and legitimate and highly profitable study anyway, textual criticism, this leaving of a question of reading to the testimony of the manuscripts is warrant enough. What we are calling attention to here, however, is the fact that Swedenborg departs from the reading of the Received Text, to which, if it is the accurately preserved text, he should of course adhere.

We hope to make some further studies, at greater length, of Swedenborg's handling of the Scripture text; but what has been said is enough to show that statements he makes about accurate preservation do not debar critical studies, and that his own practice agrees not with these statements rigidly held, but with the findings of textual criticism; indeed, his practice is itself a

limited pursuit of such work. Are we to understand his theoretical statement of the text's condition unreflectingly, and array it against the findings of scholarship, and even find it contradicted by his practice? Or are we to take his mooted statements as interpreted above, and find room for textual criticism and for him as a practicer of it?

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

CURRENT LITERATURE

VERY'S "EPITOME OF SWEDENBORG'S SCIENCE"*

As an instrument in the hands of the Lord for imparting to humanity a new revelation, Swedenborg was probably the most remarkable man who ever lived; and consequently everything about him must be of interest to the student of his life and writings. In view of his statement late in life to the effect that throughout the first fifty years and more of his career the Lord's Providence was shaping him as an instrument for the end ultimately designed, the development of the interests of his active mind from his youth up is full of significance. In this connection we find Mr. Very saying that the study of Swedenborg's science is not only "valuable for the elucidation of present-day science" (p. 15), but "indispensable for the explanation of some of his [Swedenborg's] spiritual doctrines" (p. 16). The latter idea was perhaps first imparted to Mr. Very many years ago by Dr. Samuel Howard Worcester, and may have been the inciting cause of Mr. Very's prolonged study of Swedenborg's scientific writings, which, when once begun, was carried on intermittently in connection with extended labors in modern scientific fields, and incidentally for the purpose of checking up each by the other. Moreover, with the establishment of Urbana University and the New-Church Theological School, the need was increasingly felt for some

An Epitome of Swedenborg's Science. By Frank W. Very, S.B. Boston: The Four Seas Co. Two volumes (640 and 395 pp.), 8vo., illus. $12.00.

As it has been practically impossible to secure further reviews of special parts of Very's "Epitome" to supplement those by Dr. John Swanton and Dr. J. P. Sutherland that appeared in our issue of last July, it seems best to end the consideration of this work at this time by a few remarks of a more general and superficial character.

handbook presenting a digest of Swedenborg's science. A number of years ago this need led to the formation of a Swedenborg Science Club by a group of men in the neighborhood of Boston, of whom Mr. Very was one; and this finally prompted Mr. Very to devote a large part of his time during the last few years of his life to the preparation of the various essays that unitedly, with other matter, constitute the contents of his "Epitome of Swedenborg's Science." We should remark that in this work his consideration includes the scientific content of all Swedenborg's writings, and not merely those of the first two-thirds of his life.

Mr. Very's knowledge of modern science was very broad. Though he had specialized in chemistry during his course at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, later interests took him mainly into the fields of astronomy and astrophysics, in which latter field he was recognized as one of the world's chief authorities. Here we have a breadth of interests ranging, as Swedenborg's did, throughout the span from the infinitely little to the infinitely great, and commanding a vastly greater body of facts than was conceived of two centuries ago. It is doubtful if any other New-Churchman of our day was as well versed in the whole field of modern science as Mr. Very was.

Turning now to the treatise itself, we find on pages 18 and 19 of the Introduction an important summary statement of the scientific theories of Swedenborg that were either unique with him or largely so, and that either have been confirmed in recent years, or yet await (in the opinion of Mr. Very) a destined confirmation. In one way or another these contributions of Swedenborg's to scientific theory are dealt with more at length elsewhere in the treatise. In view of limitation of space here for more extended consideration of the subjects involved, it seems best to quote these two pages in full at this point:

> Much of my scientific work in the past has been undertaken with a view to the testing of some of Swedenborg's conclusions and to supplement them by supplying missing links. . . . As time passes, much of this work will doubtless have to be recast. Swedenborg's theories are not final, nor can ours be; but it is a duty we owe to him and to ourselves to try to perfect this admirable scheme of scientific truth. We

see him sometimes searching for an idea which is just beyond his grasp and for which the necessary facts were then lacking; but *all the time he was being Divinely led toward the truth* [italics ours]. Today we can supply the facts in large measure, and thus correct and complete the first imperfect conceptions. The time seems propitious for doing so, because the firm establishment of the doctrine of energy (his "conatus"); that of "heat as a mode of motion," to use Tyndall's phrase (not peculiar to Swedenborg either, in its essential conception, since *this* doctrine was also held by Newton, though abandoned by most of his contemporaries); the conception of light as made up of discrete centers of radiant energy, the modern "light-quanta" (not to be confounded with Newton's solid "light-corpuscles," but apparently agreeing with Swedenborg's particles of vibrating ether which also have a vague affiliation with electricity, and in their oscillatory electro-magnetic fields actually demand a surrounding continuous medium, which is Swedenborg's "aura"); the discovery that electricity is made up of discrete particles (which discovery is a striking confirmation of Swedenborg's doctrine of elementary particles); the discovery that the decomposition of radium is attended by the emission of electrons and free helium atoms flung off at enormous speeds (confirming the truth of Swedenborg's idea that there are composite particles with contents in vigorous internal motion); the establishment of his hypothesis that there are in iron least material particles which are magnets with their axes pointing in every direction and neutralizing each other, but which can be turned into parallelism by stroking with a magnet, when their separate magnetic energies reënforce each other; establishment, by the X-ray examination, of Swedenborg's general hypothesis of different sorts of piling of spherical particles (atomic piling and lattice structure) in crystals; verification of his theory of the origin of "new stars" and of the "solar system"; together with hints that several other of his conceptions are just on the verge of confirmation; to say nothing of his remarkable contributions to anatomy and physiology, some of which were confirmed or re-"discovered" by others many years after, while some are not yet definitely accepted but are in a fair way to follow the rest of the list of his extraordinary previsions; and finally by no means omitting *those luminous explications of psychical phenomena, for which he will be for all time the Divinely appointed scientific witness, things long scoffed at and rejected, but destined to mark a revolution in human thought* [italics ours];—all of these things make this an appropriate time for the presentation of a revised version of Swedenborg's theories with adaptations to the present state of science. There never will be a time when a larger number of confirmations of the *essentials* of Swedenborg's scientific theories will stand ready to hand. But interpretation

and correlation of his terms with those of modern science are necessary. . . . (Pp. 18-19.)

Of things which must be thrown away from the scheme may be enumerated the Cartesian planetary vortices; the successive repetition of what is virtually the same structure in different orders of particles, whereas there is nowhere a precise repetition; the hypothesis of the crushing of the water particles in the depths of the sea to form salts; the theory of the origin of *terrestrial* magnetism and its variations; the hypothesis that elevated marine beds are due to higher tides in the earlier ages; hypotheses as to the nature and cause of color; and a few others. (P. 20.)

The above summary is quite sufficient to show that Swedenborg was a scientific genius of the first magnitude. His "guesses at truth" were amazingly penetrating, and usually correct (after his illumination "invariably correct," according to Mr. Very); but occasionally they were unquestionably faulty (for instance, his effort to explain the presence of marine fossils on mountain tops).

While anyone familiar with Swedenborg's theological works can read Mr. Very's "Epitome" with appreciation both of the greatness of Swedenborg as a scientist and of the high standing and wide knowledge of his modern expositor, it must be evident to any reader at all acquainted with modern scientific literature, that many scientists of the present time would not be inclined to read much beyond the first few pages. Why? Because Swedenborg's teaching about the sun of the spiritual world, about creation by influx from that sun, etc., etc., is introduced in the early pages of the treatise, and these fundamental ideas of a theistic and supernatural character permeate both volumes. The average scientist is so naturalistic in his assumptions that he doesn't view with patience and favor any introduction of theism and the supernatural into scientific theorizing. So far as science is concerned, he thinks we can get along very well without God and the spiritual world. The day will certainly come, however, when every scientist will be compelled to admit the actuality of the supernatural and of the spiritual (as Mr. Very has intimated in the words italicized in the above quotation); and in that day such a treatise as this "Epitome" will

appeal to a very wide circle of readers. Whatever its defects, it is a monumental work, and we can but concur in the estimate of it expressed by an eminent New-Church scientist, Professor Arthur Wesley Browne of Cornell University, whose name in the last edition of "American Men of Science" is starred because of recognized attainments in his special field of chemistry, and who has said of it:

> I find it difficult to express my opinion of this truly great piece of work, as I have been literally overwhelmed by the extent and depth of its scope. The author evinces an analytical insight second only in keenness to that of the great teacher whose work he is interpreting and comparing with the latest views of modern science. . . . Professor Very's work is, I believe, in many respects far ahead of modern science, and will be appreciated more as further advances in the theory of atomic structure are made. The book should come to be regarded as one of epochal importance in the fields of science and theology.

Now, many of the facts essential to the modern theorist have become matters of knowledge only within the last generation; and in many independent papers in scientific journals Mr. Very has contributed largely and most significantly to modern theory based upon such facts. One such theory in which he was greatly interested, and which he had set before the world in 1902 in a paper entitled "A Cosmic Cycle," has been receiving support of recent years through the writings of such scientists as Millikan and others dealing with evidence indicating the continuous formation in space of the commonest elements—helium, oxygen, nitrogen, silicon, and possibly iron—from protons and electrons. While the cosmic cycle idea is not found in Swedenborg's writings, Mr. Very seems to imply that it is involved in Swedenborg's system when he remarks: "These things are not shown in Swedenborg's thesis, but I suspect that my eyes were opened to see them through my belief in the reality and importance of the trinal principle he teaches" (Vol. I, p. 405). On page 62 of the second volume we find the following outline of the idea:

> I have shown that the universal interstellar atmosphere is "the great storehouse of energy." The whole theory includes: 1. The existence

of an interstellar atmosphere—the aura—whose reality was made known by Swedenborg. 2. The formation of matter out of the aura by the action of light—not distinctly asserted by him, but it seems to me to be a matter of logical inference from his great doctrine of *creation by influx from the spiritual Sun through emanations in a series, embodied in atmospheres arranged in discrete degrees.* 3. The destruction of matter, with the setting free of its energy of formation, to produce the heat of the stars, which in turn sends forth the light and completes the work.

But enough of the consideration of matters both sidereal and infinitessimal, which (whatever the origin of those fundamental mysteries commonly called "matter" and "energy") unitedly constitute the world of nature! By far the larger part of Mr. Very's two volumes are devoted to such consideration, though he affirms (more emphatically than any other scientist since Swedenborg) that but for the supernatural world there would have been no natural world, no living organisms, no human kind. That supernatural world receives so much incidental treatment in his pages, that from them alone a thoughtful reader would get a very comprehensive knowledge of Swedenborg's system of thought at the time of his illumination, including clear expositions of such subjects as correspondences, series and degrees, forms, etc., and of all his theological doctrines. Because of his own varied experiences of a psychic nature (which he naturally viewed from the standpoint of Swedenborg's teachings and found in their feeble measure to exemplify and confirm those teachings), and because of the great importance of battling the naturalism of the day with the results of the scientific investigation of the supernatural, he gives liberal space to the subject of Psychical Phenomena. Here he relates certain significant dreams he had had, and their interpretation. It seems unfortunate, however, that in dealing with the literature of psychical research he did not make more use of the best and most scientific of such literature in the twentieth century rather than with that of an earlier date that to the modern mind is much less evidential.

Every thoughtful reader of these volumes, and every student who approaches them for information on specific lines, must

regret that they contain no Index. The Tables of Contents are all right as far as they go; but there is decided need of a detailed ordering of all the matter throughout the thousand and more pages. The careful reader is soon aware that in any chapter under a certain heading he is likely to find matter more or less extraneous to the subject in hand, and more appropriate to some other chapter heading. Had Mr. Very himself made such an index of all the matter while in manuscript form, the lack of complete orderliness (perhaps due to his advanced age and failing health) would have been so manifest to him that he would doubtless have rearranged some of it, to the considerable advantage of the treatise as a whole. But regardless of whatever of a derogatory nature can be said of this truly great work, it will stand for many years as a worthy monument to the memory of an earnest and esteemed man, much beloved by the friends who were privileged to know him.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

"THE BLESSED WAY"*

Any one seeking to follow in the footsteps of the Lord will find Mr. Hall's little book on "The Blessed Way" inspiring, helpful, suggestive, thought-provoking, and use-inducing. In a broad, searching, tender, strong, spirit of inquiry and of devotional instruction, he presents to us the inner, vital implications of the Beatitudes and of The Way.

Taking them up one by one, he sketches with a deft hand the circumstances and environment in which the Lord gave the Beatitudes to His disciples,—men and friends whose grasp of life He would strengthen and deepen.

Mr. Hall's presentation of the deeper truths embodied in the Beatitudes is characteristically clear, appealing, and challenging. He shows the progressive growth in the Beatitudes, and their

*_The Blessed Way_ by REV. CHARLES ALBERT HALL. London: New-Church Press. 1929. 102 pp., 16mo. Paper 40c; cloth 80c.

unity with The Way. The appeal in the book is to that in us which looks to the Lord for help. It assumes such an attitude on the part of those who read it. It greatly strengthen such an attitude.

Into its hundred pages a whole philosophy of life—of joyous, useful life—is crowded. He courses through the whole Bible for illustration and light. He calls on the "good" Swedenborg for illumination.

Of purity of heart he says:

> Above the confused noises of the world it hears the voice of the Lord: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard." Above all, purity of heart detects God in Christ: it sees in Him the "personal approach of God to men," the full manifestation of the Divine Love and Wisdom, the "power of God unto salvation." We may see God in Christlikeness begotten of Christ in heavenliness which is heaven. Wherever good appears, there is God: He is in the selfless devotion of motherhood, in the heroism which risks all for a comrade, in tenderness towards little children, in the spirit which moves a man to minister to an enemy, in all devotion to others which seeks no recompense, in kindness to animals, and in the myriad selfless deeds of neighborliness and love which are the activities of heaven in earth. The discerning spirit cannot escape the countless testimonies for a Divinity which shapes human ends and is the life of all good and wise deeds. (P. 79.)

It is a book which one may carry in one's pocket and read and re-read; a book which one may confidently present to a friend seeking the Higher Light. We are indeed fortunate in having a writer and preacher in the New Church with such a broad grasp of life and its realities, and such a charming method of presenting its truths.

JOHN DABOLL.

"HISTORY OF THE HEBREWS."*

The book before us, a revised version of one published fifteen years ago, is the result of many years of class-room experience.

*_History of the Hebrews_, their political, social, and religious development, and their contribution to world betterment. By FRANK KNIGHT SANDERS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1928. xv, 395 pp., 12mo. $1.75.

In the brief space of some three hundred and sixty pages, it aims to cover the history of the Hebrews from their earliest beginnings to 135 A.D., when the rebellion under Rabbi Akiba and Bar-Cochba brought their existence as a nation to an end. The plan of the history proper is interesting. It is divided into five major periods, as follows: (1) The Childhood of the Hebrew People, from the beginning of the Bible record to the death of Moses; (2) The Growing Age of Israel's Development, from the crossing of the Jordan to the death of Solomon; (3) The Age of Ripening Maturity: Israel's Political, Social, Ethical, and Spiritual Development, covering the period from the beginning of the divided kingdom to the Babylonian exile (937-586 B.C.); (4) The Age of Mental and Spiritual Productivity, from the Babylonian exile to the establishment of Judaism under Ezra and Nehemiah (586-400 B.C.); (5) The Age of Fixed Convictions: The Jews a People Living under a Written Law, from the establishment of Judaism to the complete destruction of Jewish nationality (400 B.C.-135 A.D.). The style is simple, clear, and effective, admirably suited to the book's purpose as a text-book both for the student and for the lay reader, and as a brief and readable account of the story of the Jews, the work can be highly recommended. It is not only based upon the Bible narrative, but follows it very closely throughout, supplying from other sources only facts in regard to periods upon which the Bible narrative is silent. Each major division is carefully divided and subdivided into brief sections, and study topics and questions for the student are from time to time inserted. The book is well indexed, and a bibliography for the use of teacher and student is appended.

Throughout the work, Dr. Sanders evinces a deep reverence for the Bible and a keen appreciation of its historical and inspirational value. In the Foreword he says:

> This volume seeks to make clear the important place of the Hebrew people in the history of nations, and to justify the selection of their history, as set forth in the Old Testament, as an introduction to the even wider range of universal history.

And he goes much further in his statements as to its inspirational character:

> The study of history through the Old Testament, following the clue of the growth of the Hebrew nation, has another unique value. Inasmuch as the Hebrews grew slowly from a primitive stage of social development into a cultured, balanced nation, their religious experiences paralleled that of every thoughtful human being, in his development from childhood to maturity. Somewhere in these Biblical records everyone, young or old, finds a reflex of his religious attitude and some satisfaction of his religious needs. This accounts for the wonderful helpfulness of the Bible to all honest-minded searchers after truth. It also explains why some portions of the Bible appeal to us more strongly at one time than another, and why some portions appeal to growing minds while other sections have a message only for those of ripened religious experience. (P. 8.)

The sub-title of the book shows that Dr. Sanders is using the word "history" in an inclusive sense. He undertakes more than merely to retell the story of the Jews. He cannot deal with "their contribution to world betterment" without attempting an evaluation of the Bible itself; and of necessity the historicity and authenticity of the Bible narrative is constantly called in question. Here his intuitive perception of the Bible as a revelation from God yields to the naturalistic concepts of current Bible scholarship. His own sound intuitions are evidenced by unconscious phrasings throughout the book:

> It was natural that, when God wished to adequately reveal Himself to men, He should choose *as His mouthpiece*, or agent, a Semitic people. (P. 19.)

> Compared with other sacred literatures, that which was wrought out *through* the Hebrew people is in a class by itself. Interpreted historically, in full sympathy with the conditions which influenced it, it is increasingly to the faithful student a *revelation* of the very heart of God and of His gracious *purpose* to promote the task of proclaiming His goodness and love to the world until all mankind shall bow at His feet." (P. 359; the italics are the reviewer's.)

But lacking a logical basis for these intuitions, such as the New-Church Doctrine of the Word supplies, he is forced, in dealing with the origin of the various books of the Bible, to

fall back upon the natural history explanation of the modern critics.

There is much in the book which the New-Churchman cannot accept. For example, he adopts the idea that the Jews were a specially gifted and essentially religious people, and that for this reason their literature could become the Bible; that their concept of God progressed in breath and purity throughout their history; that the most valuable classification of the books of the Bible is according to their literary types; and that a knowledge of the date and character of each book is essential to the proper understanding of it. He makes the various Bible characters vivid persons; but naturally he fails to recognize their strictly representative function. He shows an appreciation of the use and value of symbolism throughout the Bible, and especially in the first eleven chapters of Genesis; but he adopts without question the theory of the late origin of the present form of these chapters. He seems to treat all the reverses of the Hebrew people as purely political, and not to recognize their spiritual origin. A few quotations will serve to illustrate some of these weaknesses:

> This chapter (Genesis 1) fitly opens the Bible. It is a religious masterpiece. Its lofty monotheism reflects, however, not a primitive age but the ripest age of prophetic thinking. Some great unknown, centuries after the days of Moses, composed it as a fitting beginning to the story of God's relationship with the universe. (P. 26.)

> The founders of three great world religions were Semites: Jesus, Moses, and Muhammad. (P. 19.)

> In a narrative like this . . . the line is sometimes obscure between symbolism and facts. The "pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night" is a good example. Nothing is more characteristic of caravan travel in the desert than the use of a brazier at the end of a long pole, whereby a caravan strung out over the desert may be made aware of the whereabouts of the leader. In this fashion God is said to have led the people. (P. 62.)

> The story of Samson has little religious value, but gives much insight into the popular life of the times. He is the sort of a hero whom the country people would love. (P. 91.)

> The book of Daniel cannot be used as a historical source for the reasons that the author, who lived some centuries later in the early

Maccabean age, misunderstood the historical sources to which he had access, unwittingly made them contravene records which are indisputable, and used them for his own special purpose of stirring up his fellow-countrymen to a great loyalty to God. (P. 226.)

Apocalypse may be defined as looking forward to the achievement of God's purposes by His sudden, supernatural intervention. It must be distinguished from genuine prophecy, which conceives the future as a time when nations and individuals will be inwardly transformed into loyal children of God. Prophecy hopes to convert the wicked; apocalypse would destroy them and thus give room for righteousness. (P. 338.)

These quotations, taken at random from the book, show the demoralizing influence of modern Bible study, based, as it is, upon the assumption that the Bible is of human rather than of Divine origin. This same influence is undoubtedly responsible for one other serious weakness in the book, the lack of any adequate treatment of the New Testament. The transition from Judaism to Christianity is covered in a brief paragraph, and there is apparently in the author's mind no connection between the rejection of Christ by the Jews and their downfall as a nation. Although, from the standpoint of the author, the contribution of the Jewish race to the world culminates in Christ, no attempt is made to define His character or to appraise His work. It is hard to see how anyone who accepts the conclusions of the "higher criticism" can bridge the gap between the Old and the New Testaments.

Notwithstanding these defects, the book is well worth reading, and may prove helpful to the student in many ways.

LOUIS A. DOLE.

"THE HOLY KABBALAH"*

The fly-leaf before the title-page of this most important work in English on "The Holy Kabbalah" contains a list of eight previous works by the author, Arthur Edward Waite, averaging

*THE HOLY KABBALAH; a Study of the Secret Tradition in Israel as unfolded by Sons of the Doctrine for the benefit and consolation of the Elect dispersed through the lands and ages of the Greater Exile. By A. E. WAITE. New York: Macmillan. 1929. 662 pp., 8 vo., 4 plates. $7.50.

over five hundred pages each, and all of them dealing with the subject of the Secret Tradition. Only two of these were still in print when the present volume was published; but the list informs us that two others—namely, "The Secret Doctrine in Israel" (330 pages) and "The Doctrine and Literature of the Kabbalah" (508 pages)—have been incorporated in the volume before us, the author elsewhere informing us that this recent work is a final revision and digest of his old books and monographs on the subject.

In his Preface Mr. Waite tells us in so many words that he is a Christian mystic, and that this latest product of his pen has been written chiefly for the use of mystics.

Mr. Waite has been a life-long student (his first book appeared before 1890) of mystical and occult literature, in the effort to get at whatever is of real worth in those fields, and to present such matters, as far as possible, in readily understandable terms. During his careful investigations of these subjects, he has sought first-hand acquaintance with the literature concerned, and has shown many supposed "authorities" to be quite unscholarly and consequently unreliable. In this connection he remarks "I have performed many arid journeys in my time and have returned with an empty wallet; but if this [investigation of the Holy Kabbalah] had been one of them, I should not have written its itinerary in the present study of the *Zohar*" (p. 371).

The "Zohar" is the fundamental text of Kabbalism. It contains a traditional commentary on the Pentateuch involving the Secret Doctrine of Israel. Our author maintains that it is "one of the great books of the world, one also which stands alone and is comparable to nothing save itself."

> The Kabbalah . . . claims to be the light of a Secret Traditional Knowledge preserved among the "Chosen People," and the subjects with which it is concerned, as might be expected, are Sacred and Divine Subjects: they include the most profound Mysteries of God and the Emanations of Diety; the celestial economy; the process of creation; the scheme of Providence in regard to man; the communications of God in revelation, and to the just in His Church; the offices and ministries of good and evil angels; the nature and pre-existence of the soul, its union with matter, and its metempsychosis; the mystery of sin, and its penalties;

the Messiah, His kingdom and His glory to be revealed: the state of the soul after death, and the resurrection of the dead: with occasional, too rare but pregnant, intimations of the union of the soul and God. . . Here also, if anywhere, is the abiding part, rooted in everylasting values, and the one voice among many voices, of old Tradition which bears a message from the past to the modern world. (P. 5.)

The Kabbalah, in a word, is the hidden thought of Israel upon doctrines of Jewish Religion (which are in many cases Christian doctrines) and upon the proper understanding of that Written Word which is referred to a Divine Origin both in Christendom and Jewry. (P. 6.)

The Secret Doctrine . . . is of course, broadly and generally, a method of interpreting Scripture; but so far as this expression is to be understood in an ordinary sense, as an actual and logical construction of the letter, the interpretation . . . is of no value—for the most part, at least. It is to be taken or left in the sense of its own motive, which is to establish, at any and all cost, a Secret Doctrine on the foundation of the Old Testament; and in the light of this it signified little that the Doctrine, in respect of exegesis, was arbitrary to the last degree: one would scarcely expect it to be otherwise, having regard to the Rabbinical mind. The point in chief for ourselves is that the mills of those . . . Sons of the Doctrine produced and polished great things in their processes—pure and precious jewels of the spirit—as well as much dust and scoria from the matter which they passed through their hands. It is only as if casually that the word "interpretation" can be held to apply in any solid sense: the Secret Doctrine is rather the sense below the sense which is found in the literal word. (P. 11.)

We cannot give much time to this volume at present; but as the doctrines of the New Church are contained in the internal sense of Scripture as revealed by Swedenborg, as his works set forth a detailed exposition of the internal sense of the first two books of the Pentateuch, and as he definitely states that the internal sense of Scripture is the mystical sense, it is evident that the Kabbalah offers an alluring field of research for any open-minded New-Church scholar, a field that will doubtless be explored with care by some such scholar in the future. Our present purpose will be served if we have succeeded in introducing this work to New-Church readers by this brief and uncritical notice.

Before closing we will mention one or two of the many things in this volume that have caught our attention. First, in the part dealing with "The Higher Secret Doctrine," there is a most

interesting chapter on the Mystery of Sex, in which the fundamental characteristics of both man and woman are attributed to the God-head, and much is said about the relation of the sexes here and hereafter.

Again, we find the following interesting reference to Swedenborg:

> The Doctrine of Correspondences, which obtains everywhere in the Secret Doctrine—whatever the schools thereof— . . . has been reflected thence into systems which cannot be included in the same category. It would seem further to have been discovered at first hand by a few seers —as, for example, Jacob Boehme and perhaps Swedenborg. It is the erection of an inevitable anthropomorphism into a philosophical doctrine, though when I say this I may be sanctifying the seeming limitation. It is at least true that man is, for all concern of man, the measure of the whole creation; and if the testimony of creation is true—as Liebnitz would have held—then that which we discern intellectually is in the likeness of the truth of things. But this is the Doctrine of Correspondences. (P. 225.)

That seems a queer way of explaining what is meant by correspondences; and it certainly isn't based upon a knowledge of what Swedenborg teaches on the subject. As regards the use of correspondences in interpreting Scripture, there seems to be nothing of it of a definite kind in the volume; such an expression as "Truth shall spring out of the earth" (Ps. lxxxv., 11), for instance, resulting in the inference that grass signifies truth.

In connection with the name of Jacob Boehme in the above passage, there is an interesting footnote reading as follows:

> A comparison between Boehme's "Mysterium Magnum," which is a commentary on Genesis, and the "Zohar" on the same text would bring out some extraordinary parallels, and would increase the zeal of speculation concerning the glass of vision into which the German mystic looked. It was assuredly a glass which was common in several respects to other seers besides himself. His intimations on the first estate of man, on the making of woman, on Paradise and the Mystery of the Fall, offer recurring analogies with Jewish Theosophy.

We are not aware that anyone has ever made a comparative study of Boehme and Swedenborg in these respects, by which one might glimpse any similarity between Swedenborg and the "Zohar" on these points; and the elucidations of scattered frag-

ments of the Pentateuch contained in the volume before us are seldom of a nature to remind us of Swedenborg. But it should be borne in mind that much of Boehme's writing was "automatic," and that this implies the possibility that the spirit (or spirits) that obsessed him may have been some adept of the Secret Doctrine on the spiritual plane; while all that Swedenborg wrote and preserved was consciously and voluntarily done by him in the full activity of his own faculties, and stands before mankind not as a result of mere scholarship but as constituting a definite body of revelation from the Lord in exposition of the inner meaning of the Scriptures and of the true doctrines of Christianity.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

THE MIND AT MISCHIEF*

Dr. Sadler's book entitled "The Mind at Mischief" is written from the materialistic point of view. It dwells in large measure on the disorders of mental and physical conditions. The effort seems to be to recognize the disorderly conditions of the mind and body, and to discuss the means of correcting them so as to restore the mind and body to health. But at the same time there is a strong determination against any acknowledgment of the reality of the spiritual world, or of man's living after the death of the physical body. It distinctly places man in the same category as animals, and assumes that death is the end of his life and existence.

Dr. Sadler shows the two opposite tendencies of the human mind on this subject of man's eternal life. He says:

> Just about the time when the scientists succeed in convincing the people that there is no spirit, that all is material, the average individual, having found the dry husks of materialism useless for the quenching of an ever-present spiritual thirst, turns in revolt to some creed at the other extreme of credulity. Refusing to believe that when he dies he is merely going, like the cats and dogs and other beasts, to rot in the ground and be no more, the distraught and spiritually famished in-

**The Mind at Mischief.* By WILLIAM S. SADLER, M.D., F.A.C.S. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1929. 400 pp., 8vo. $4.00.

dividual settles his philosophic difficulties by suddenly abandoning the ship of scientific materialism, and startles us by taking one grand plunge into the sophistries and delusions of Christian Science, spiritism, or some other mystic, metaphysical cult. . . . The theologians refuse to accept new scientific truth, and the scientists refuse to recognize the necessity for, and reality of, the spiritual domain of human thought. . . .

Scientists have largely failed to recognize that while man is an animal, he is an animal plus—plus something which science has nothing to do with, and which scientists can never prove nor disprove by laboratory methods. Religionists, scientists, and philosophers must learn to function in their own spheres, and to allow their contemporaries to do likewise. (Pp. 352, 353.)

Here the author distinctly recognizes the specific fields which religionists, scientists, and philosophers should occupy. If we may briefly state these fields, they are as follows: (1) Religionists occupy especially the field of the spiritual plane of life, which deals with the existence and qualities of God. This is for the most part on the spiritual plane, and above the material. (2) Philosophers deal largely with the rational explanation of things, which may be applied either to spiritual or natural things. (3) Scientists are concerned mainly with things of the material plane, and (viewing psychology as altogether within the domain of science) in no wise with things outside the natural plane.

When we see clearly this division into three parts,—spiritual, rational, and scientific,—we may arrive at a knowledge of the things of the spiritual and the natural worlds, and we can then avoid the errors which many men fall into by not recognizing these two discrete degrees of life. There are two discretely different worlds, the spiritual and the natural; the spiritual relates to the life after death, the natural relates to the material world. Religion teaches us about the spiritual; science teaches us about the material. Each has a specific relation to the other; but one cannot take the place of the other. Religion gives us laws for the development of the spiritual life. Science gives us the laws for the development of the natural life. There is harmony and not antagonism when each is true. But while Dr. Sadler here recognizes these distinct fields of thought, in the rest of his book he loses sight of the distinction altogether.

The substance of the book is filled with the analysis of the feelings, the emotions, and the control of the mind and the body. All the various emotions are regarded as elements of natural development, as spontaneous states of the mind and life. In this unfoldment the position held is, that the development of the mind and life is largely a matter of self-development, most of which is disorderly; so that in the course of time very disorderly conditions arise, which are very injurious, and which need to be remedied by corrective influences.

The dual nature of man is recognized by the author. There is the conscious or external mind, and the unconscious or internal mind. This unconscious mind is not reliable. It is full of vagaries. There is the unconscious wish, dreams, mediumship, communications with the dead, and many other forms of mental activity, in which there is nothing spiritual and true. All are regarded as mere mental activities developed from the physical nature. In large measure man's mental activity is believed to be merely a growth of his natural degree.

According to this view there is a psychology of self-deception. Innumerable things in the infantile and childlike ages are regarded as in large measure merely imaginative, resting on no solid foundation. There are facts and fancies, imagination and fairy stories. Consequently there is nothing solid and true to rest upon in order that a healthy development may result. In consequence of this, large numbers of people lose their balance, and need the help of the physician to restore them to health.

The book notices many psychic activities, but reduces them all to merely natural causes or disorders. Because many phenomena seem to have disorderly origins, there is no recognition of the truth that in the psychical realm there are orderly activities of spiritual forces as well as disorderly ones.

The final conclusion is that the material is everything, and that the spiritual and the divine are nothing, or at least are very uncertain. The book promotes disbelief in the spiritual world and the life after death.

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

The regular price for the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW is $2.00
and for the NEW-CHURCH LEAGUE JOURNAL is $1.00

WE OFFER
A JOINT SUBSCRIPTION TO BOTH FOR $2.50

provided such joint subscription adds a new name to at least one of the periodicals. Such joint subscription may be addressed either to the LEAGUE JOURNAL or to the

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, 134 Bowdoin St., BOSTON, MASS.

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION
Incorporated

18 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, atthe age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room, 117 So. High St.

Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.

Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.

Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Room 1726, 17 N. State St.

Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak and Winslow Streets.

Detroit, Mich. Church Book Shop, 92 E. Forest Ave.

Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.

Minneapolis, Minn. New-Church Book Shop, 903 Fifth Ave., So.

New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights, N. Y. City.

Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.

San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.

St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.

Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street.

Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 486 Euclid Ave.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.

Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.

Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland, 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay, Swedenborg Society of India, 7 Topiwala's Bldgs., Sandhurst Road, Girgaum, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Lausanne, Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 1 Avenue de France.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President*,
CHARLES N. MASON,
JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.